

California  
onal  
ity

LOS·AN  
GELES  
PVB  
LIC  
LIB  
RA  
RY



EX-LIBRIS



1910  
R 361.973 N277 v.6



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation









SIXTH BIENNIAL SESSION

OF THE

NATIONAL CONFERENCE

OF

JEWISH CHARITIES

in the United States

HELD IN THE CITY OF ST. LOUIS 1910

11361.972 7/277 4.6

May 17th to 19th, 1910

JAN 26 1932

BALTIMORE

PRESS OF KOHN & POLLOCK, INC.

1910

SERIAL



SRLF  
 URL  
 HV  
 3191  
 N38  
 1810

## CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
OFFICERS, 1908-1910.....	5
OFFICERS, 1910-1912.....	6
CONSTITUTION.....	7
MEMBERSHIP OF THE CONFERENCE.....	10
REGISTER OF DELEGATES.....	19
PROGRAMME.....	25
PROCEEDINGS.....	28
OPENING SESSION.....	28
<i>Prayer: Rabbi Samuel Sale</i> .....	28
<i>Address of Welcome: Hon. Elias Michael</i> .....	29
<i>Presidential Address: Prof. J. H. Hollander</i> .....	32
<i>Address: Jane Addams</i> .....	39
<i>Report of Committee on Transportation: Judge Julian W. Mack</i> .....	41
<i>Secretary's Report: Louis H. Levin</i> .....	45
<i>Prayer: Rabbi Leon Harrison</i> .....	53
WEDNESDAY MORNING SESSION.....	54
<i>Family Desertion: Morris D. Waldman</i> .....	54
Discussion: Max Senior.....	84
Benjamin Tuska.....	86
A. S. Newman.....	95
Mrs. C. A. Stix.....	101
Boris D. Bogen.....	103
Mrs. Henry Solomon.....	103
S. B. Kaufman.....	104
Cyrus L. Sulzberger.....	104
Miriam Kalisky.....	105
G. A. Berlinsky.....	106
Jacob Billikopf.....	107
Morris D. Waldman.....	110
WEDNESDAY AFTERNOON SESSION.....	111
<i>The Removal Work, Including Galveston: David M. Bressler</i> .....	111
Discussion: Jonas Weil.....	141
Rabbi Ephraim Frisch.....	144
Cyrus L. Sulzberger.....	152
Rabbi I. L. Leucht.....	157
S. H. Frohlichstein.....	158
Jacob Billikopf.....	160
Jacob Furth.....	163
Rabbi M. Samfield.....	165
David M. Bressler.....	166
Report of Committee on President's Message.....	167

	PAGE.
WEDNESDAY EVENING SESSION.....	168
<i>Legal Aid</i> : Minnie F. Low.....	168
Discussion: Bernard Greensfelder.....	186
Max B. May.....	191
Max Herzberg.....	197
Mrs. Henry Solomon.....	198
Minnie F. Low.....	198
BUSINESS SESSION.....	199
Resolutions.....	200
Election of Officers.....	203
THURSDAY MORNING SESSION.....	204
<i>A Study of the Problem of Boarding Out Children</i> : Solomon Lowenstein.....	204
Discussion: Henry Mauser.....	219
Armand Wyle.....	222
Morris D. Waldman.....	227
Chester J. Teller.....	228
Saul Drucker.....	229
Mrs. Henry Solomon.....	231
Minnie F. Low.....	232
Rabbi Max Landsberg.....	237
<i>Special Education of Jewish Dependent Children</i> : Chester Jacob Teller.....	239
THURSDAY AFTERNOON SESSION.....	248
Discussion of Mr. Teller's paper:	
Prof. H. L. Sabsovich.....	248
Henry Woolf.....	250
<i>The Relation of a Social Worker to His Organization</i> : Boris D. Bogen..	254
Discussion: Montefiore Bienenstok.....	265
Chester J. Teller.....	270
Rabbi Rudolph I. Coffee.....	271
Cyrus L. Sulzberger.....	272
Boris D. Bogen.....	273
<i>Work of Y. M. H. A. of New York</i> : Falk Younker.....	274
<i>Social Work as a Profession</i> : Louis H. Levin.....	278
Discussion: Rabbi Sidney E. Goldstein.....	287
Philip L. Seman.....	291
Business Meeting.....	296
<i>Prayer</i> :	
Rabbi Dr. Mendel Silber.....	297
Treasurer's Report.....	298
Transportation Decisions.....	307
Transportation Rules.....	307
Index.....	319

## OFFICERS 1908-1910

---

President.

JACOB H. HOLLANDER, BALTIMORE, MD.

Vice-Presidents.

MARTIN A. MARKS, CLEVELAND, OHIO.

MRS. MAX LANDSBERG, ROCHESTER, N. Y.

Secretary.

LOUIS H. LEVIN, BALTIMORE, MD.,  
411 West Fayette Street.

Treasurer.

BERNARD GREENSFELDER, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Executive Committee.

MAX SENIOR, CINCINNATI, OHIO.

MAX HERZBERG, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

JULIAN W. MACK, CHICAGO, ILL.

NATHAN BIJUR, NEW YORK, N. Y.

JOSEPH H. COHEN, NEW YORK, N. Y.

SAMUEL S. FLEISHER, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

LEE K. FRANKEL, NEW YORK, N. Y.

JULIUS ROSENWALD, CHICAGO, ILL.

LUCIUS L. SOLOMONS, SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

## OFFICERS 1910-1912

---

President.

LEE K. FRANKEL, NEW YORK, N. Y.

Vice-Presidents.

JULIUS ROSENWALD, CHICAGO, ILL.

SIDNEY E. PRITZ, CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Treasurer.

BERNARD GREENSFELDER, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Secretary.

LOUIS H. LEVIN, BALTIMORE, MD.,

411 West Fayette Street.

Executive Committee.

MAX SENIOR, CINCINNATI, OHIO.

MAX HERZBERG, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

JULIAN W. MACK, CHICAGO, ILL.

NATHAN BIJUR, NEW YORK, N. Y.

JACOB H. HOLLANDER, BALTIMORE, MD.

SAMUEL S. FLEISHER, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

ALFRED BENJAMIN, KANSAS CITY, MO.

MINNIE F. LOW, CHICAGO, ILL.

AARON WALDHEIM, ST. LOUIS, MO.

JONAS WEIL, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.



**CONSTITUTION**  
OF THE  
**National Conference of Jewish Charities**  
IN THE UNITED STATES

---

ARTICLE I.—NAME.

This association shall be known as the National Conference of Jewish Charities in the United States.

ARTICLE II.—OBJECTS.

The objects of this association are to discuss the problems of charities and to promote reforms in their administration; to provide uniformity of action and co-operation in all matters pertaining to the relief and betterment of the Jewish poor of the United States, without, however, interfering in any manner with the local work of any constituent society.

ARTICLE III.—MEMBERSHIP AND DUES.

SECTION 1. Any regularly organized Jewish Society of the United States having charitable and philanthropic purposes may become a member of the association on application made to the Secretary and on payment of the membership dues.

SEC. 2. The annual Membership Dues in a city where Federation exists shall be for such Federation one per cent. (1%) of the annual amount expended by it for its corporate purposes during the preceding year; not less, however, than five dollars (\$5.00) nor more than fifty dollars (\$50.00); and dues of five dollars (\$5.00) for any constituent member of such Federation that shall desire membership in this Conference.

In cities where no Federation exists, the annual membership dues for each society shall be five dollars (\$5.00) where its expenditures as above are less than five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00) and ten dollars (\$10.00) for all others.

Individuals may become subscribing members upon the payment of one dollar (\$1.00) dues annually, for which they shall be entitled to all the publications of the Conference, but they shall have no vote.

SEC. 3. Each constituent society shall be entitled to one delegate, but may appoint as many as it sees fit to attend the biennial meeting. All such delegates shall be entitled to participate in said meeting, but each society shall have but one vote.

SEC. 4. Each constituent society shall certify to the Secretary on or before January 1 of each year the amount of its expenditures for its corporate purposes during the preceding fiscal year.

#### ARTICLE IV.—OFFICERS.

SECTION 1. The officers of the Conference shall be a President, two Vice-Presidents, a Treasurer and a Secretary, who, with five other elective members and all ex-presidents *ex-officio*, shall constitute the Executive Committee. Officers shall be elected by ballot at the biennial meeting, and shall hold office two years and until their successors are elected and inducted.

SEC. 2. Vacancies in any of the offices provided in Section 1 of this Article may be filled for the unexpired portion of the term of office at any meeting of the Executive Committee.

#### ARTICLE V.—DUTIES OF OFFICERS.

SECTION 1. The officers of this Conference shall perform the duties usually incumbent upon such officers, and shall submit a report at the biennial meeting.

SEC. 2. The Executive Committee shall transact the business of the Conference in the interim between the biennial meetings. It shall arrange for the biennial meeting, and have the power to appoint regular and special committees.

SEC. 3. The Executive Committee shall meet at the call of the President, or at the request of three members. Four members shall constitute a quorum.

SEC. 4. When the Executive Committee is not in session it may, by majority vote of its members acting individually, authorize any action first submitted in writing to each of them.

## ARTICLE VI.—MEETINGS.

SECTION 1. This Conference shall meet biennially at such place and time as the Executive Committee shall designate.

SEC. 2. Delegates representing fifteen constituent societies shall constitute a quorum at such biennial meetings.

## ARTICLE VII.—AMENDMENTS.

This constitution may be amended at any biennial meeting by a majority vote of the societies represented, provided notice of the proposed amendment shall have been mailed to all the constituent societies at least sixty days prior to such meeting; or it may be amended at any time by a majority vote of all the constituent societies. It shall be the duty of the Executive Committee to submit all proposed amendments.

# MEMBERSHIP

## National Conference of Jewish Charities

### IN THE UNITED STATES

---

#### NAME OF SOCIETY.

- Albany, N. Y. . . . . Hebrew Benevolent Society, Dr. M. Schlessinger, Secty., 334 Hudson Ave.
- Albany, N. Y. . . . . Jewish Home Society, Albert Hessberg, Pres., 57 State St.
- Alexandria, Va. . . . . Hebrew Benevolent Society, Dr. N. Wolberg, Secty.
- Atlanta, Ga. . . . . Federation of Jewish Charities, V. H. Kriegshaber, Pres., 8 N. Forsyth St.
- Atlanta, Ga. . . . . Hebrew Orphan Home of Atlanta, Ga., Max Cohen, Secty. and Treas., 509 Seventh St. N. W., Washington, D. C.
- Atlanta, Ga. . . . . Montefiore Relief Association, A. Schwarz, Secty.
- Baltimore, Md. . . . . The Federated Jewish Charities of Baltimore, Louis H. Levin, Secty., 411 W. Fayette St.
- Baltimore, Md. . . . . Hebrew Benevolent Society, Louis H. Levin, Secty., 411 W. Fayette St.
- Baltimore, Md. . . . . United Hebrew Charities of Baltimore, Daniel Ellison, Secty., 1017 E. Baltimore St.
- Birmingham, Ala. . . . . United Hebrew Charities, Mr. E. Lesser, Pres.
- Boston, Mass. . . . . Hebrew Women's Sewing Society, Mrs. Ely Feibelman, Clerk, 15 Montague St., Dorchester, Mass.
- Boston, Mass. . . . . United Hebrew Benevolent Society, Max Mitchell, Supt., Charity Bldg., Chardon St.

- Braddock, Pa. . . . . Braddock Lodge, No. 516, I. O. B. B., Morris Adler, Secty., 8th St. and Braddock Ave.
- Buffalo, N. Y. . . . . Federated Jewish Charities, Miss Cecil B. Wiener, Rec. Secty., 830 Prudential Bldg.
- Buffalo, N. Y. . . . . Hebrew Benevolent Loan Association, Emil Rubinstein, Secty., 267 William St.
- Charleston, S. C. . . . . Hebrew Benevolent Society, M. H. Nathan, Secty., and Treas., 168 E. Bay St.
- Chicago, Ill. . . . . Associated Jewish Charities, Abraham Hirschberg, Secty., 108 La Salle St.
- Chicago, Ill. . . . . Bureau of Personal Service, Miss Minnie F. Low, Supt., 720 W. 12th St.
- Chicago, Ill. . . . . Chicago Women's Aid, Mrs. Benj. Rosenberg, Secty., 3358 Calumet Ave.
- Chicago, Ill. . . . . Home of Jewish Friendless Working Girls, Elias Mayer, Rec. Secty., 810 Clark St.
- Chicago, Ill. . . . . Jewish Aid Society, Louis M. Cahn, Secty., Tribune Bldg.
- Cincinnati, Ohio. . . . . United Jewish Charities, Mr. Max Senior, Pres.; Dr. Boris D. Bogen, Supt., 730 Carlisle St.
- Cleveland, Ohio. . . . . The Federation of Jewish Charities, E. M. Baker, Secty., 513 Citizens Bldg.
- Cleveland, Ohio. . . . . Jewish Orphan Asylum, Dr. S. Wolfenstein, Supt.
- Colorado Springs, Col. Hebrew Benevolent Society, W. Leipheimer, Secty., P. O. Box 445.
- Columbus, Ohio. . . . . Jewish Charities, Mr. Paul Karger, Secty., 333 Columbus Savings and Trust Bldg.
- Dallas, Tex. . . . . Congregation Emanu El, Mr. D. A. Eldridge, Secty.
- Dayton, Ohio. . . . . Hebrew Ladies' Relief Society, Mrs. J. Haas, Secty., 228 Maple St.
- Denver, Col. . . . . Jewish Relief Society, Mrs. L. Bruck, Supt., 30 Pioneer Bldg.

- Denver, Col. . . . . Denver Sheltering Home for Jewish Children, Meyer Friedman, Treas., 3247 W. 19th St.
- Denver, Col. . . . . Jewish Consumptives Relief Society, Dr. Chas. D. Spivak, Seety.
- Des Moines, Ia. . . . . Federated Jewish Charities, Mrs. S. Levinson, Seety., 1031 Sixth Ave.
- Detroit, Mich. . . . . Detroit Ladies' Society for Support of Widows and Orphans, Flora B. Margmont, Seety.
- Detroit, Mich. . . . . United Jewish Charities, A. Benjamin, Seety., 239 E. High St.
- Duluth, Minn. . . . . Temple Aid Society, Mrs. M. Cornfield, Seety., care of Hotel Spalding.
- El Paso, Tex. . . . . Mt. Sinai Congregation, Martin Zielonka, Seety., P. O. Box 756.
- Evansville, Ind. . . . . Hebrew Benevolent Society, Mrs. M. Oberdorfer, Pres., 1245 Upper First St.
- Fort Wayne, Ind. . . . . Hebrew Relief Union, Joseph Freiburger, Pres.
- Gainesville, Tex. . . . . United Hebrew Congregation of Gainesville, Tex., I. Cohen, Seety., Church and Red River Sts.
- Galveston, Tex. . . . . The Hebrew Benevolent Society, E. W. Levy, Seety.
- Hot Springs, Ark. . . . . Hot Spring Relief Society, Rabbi A. B. Rhine, Seety.
- Houston, Tex. . . . . Beth Israel Benevolent Society, S. Freundlich, Seety., 1612 Bell Ave.
- Houston, Tex. . . . . Jewish Women's Benevolent Association, Miss A. Westheimer, Seety., 1612 Hadley Ave.
- Indianapolis, Ind. . . . . The Jewish Federation, 821 S. Meridian St., S. B. Kaufman, Supt.

- Kalamazoo, Mich....Congregation B'nai Israel, Samuel Folz,  
Main and Portage Sts.
- Kansas City, Mo.....Hebrew Ladies' Relief Association, Mrs. H.  
Levite, Pres., 1413 E. 13th St.; Mrs. S.  
Lensitz, Secty., 1741 Lydia Ave.
- Kansas City, Mo.....Hochnosas Orchim, S. Zacharias, Pres., 1617  
Forest St.
- Kansas City, Mo.....United Jewish Charities, Jacob Billikopf,  
Supt., 1702 Locust St.
- Lancaster, Pa.....United Hebrew Charity Association, Jonas  
Fox, Secty., 123 E. King St.
- Lincoln, Neb.....The Jewish Ladies' Aid Society, Mrs. Wm.  
Gold, Secty., 1712 E. Fifth St.
- Los Angeles, Cal....Hebrew Benevolent Society, N. Zeisler,  
Secty., 110 New Hellman Block.
- Louisville, Ky.....Federation of Jewish Charities, 531 S. First  
St., Garfield A. Berlinsky, Secty.
- Louisville, Ky.....Congregation Adath Israel, Mr. M. Strauss,  
Secty., 746 N. Main St.
- Louisville, Ky.....United Hebrew Relief Association, G. S.  
Rosenberg, Secty., 1721 First St.
- Mattapan, Mass.....Leopold Morse Home and Orphanage, Henry  
Woolf, Supt.
- Memphis, Tenn.....United Hebrew Relief Association, 218  
Adams St., Dr. M. Samfield, Pres.
- Meridian, Miss.....Meridian Jewish Orphans' Home and Be-  
nevolent Association, Rabbi Max Raisin,  
Secty.
- Milwaukee, Wis.....Hebrew Relief Association, Louis Lachman,  
Secty., 806 Wall St.
- Milwaukee, Wis.....Independent Jewish Charities, Louis Cohen,  
Secty., 441 Seventh St.
- Milwaukee, Wis.....Ladies' Relief Sewing Society, Mrs. Wm.  
Baum, Secty., 1816 State St.



- Milwaukee, Wis. . . . . Mt. Sinai Hospital, Leopold Hammel, Secty.
- Milwaukee, Wis. . . . . Ladies' Sanitary and Benevolent Society,  
Mrs. J. W. Primakow, Secty., 1024 Eighth  
St.
- Minneapolis, Minn. . . . Associated Jewish Charities, J. H. Schan-  
feld, Chairman of Relief Committee,  
Metropolitan Life Bldg.
- Mobile, Ala. . . . . United Hebrew Charities, Henry Hess, Pres.
- Montgomery, Ala. . . . . United Hebrew Charities, Jacques Loeb,  
Secty., 101 Talapoosa St.
- Nashville, Tenn. . . . . Hebrew Relief Society, D. Cline, Secty., 128  
N. Market St.
- Newark, N. J. . . . . Hebrew Orphan Asylum and Benevolent  
Society, Mr. G. J. Kempe, Secty., 530  
Clinton Ave.
- New Haven, Conn. . . . Hebrew Benevolent Society, F. M. Adler,  
Secty., care of Strause, Adler & Co.
- New Orleans, La. . . . . Assoc. Relief of Jewish Widows and Or-  
phans, F. S. Weis, Secty., P. O. Box 966.
- New Orleans, La. . . . . Touro Infirmary and Hebrew Benevolent  
Association, Chas. Rosen, Secty., 3516  
Prytania St.
- New York, N. Y. . . . . Baron de Hirsch Fund, Prof. H. L. Sabso-  
vich, General Agent, 43 Exchange Place.
- New York, N. Y. . . . . Council of Jewish Women, Miss Sadie  
American, Secty., 448 Central Park, W.
- New York, N. Y. . . . . The Free Synagogue, Rabbi Stephen S.  
Wise, 46 E. 68th St.
- New York, N. Y. . . . . Hebrew Free Loan Association, 108 Second  
Ave.
- New York, N. Y. . . . . Hebrew Sheltering and Immigrant Aid So-  
ciety, Judge Leon Sanders, Pres., 229 E.  
Broadway.
- New York, N. Y. . . . . Ladies' Fuel and Aid Society, J. M. Gue-  
dalia, Secty., 132 Nassau St.



- New York, N. Y. . . . . Montefiore Home, Arthur D. Wolf, Hon. Secty., Broadway and 138th St.
- New York, N. Y. . . . . Hebrew Orphan Asylum, 137th St. and Amsterdam Ave., Theo. Obermeyer, Secty.
- New York, N. Y. . . . . United Hebrew Charities, Dr. Morris D. Waldman, Mgr., 356 Second Ave.
- New York, N. Y. . . . . Young Men's Hebrew Association, 92d St. and Lexington Ave., Falk Younker, Supt.
- Niagara Falls, N. Y. . . . . Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Miss Theresa Garsman, Secty., 826 Willow Ave.
- Norfolk, Va. . . . . . . . . . Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Mrs. Chas. Meyers, Secty., 244 Holt St.
- Oakland, Cal. . . . . . . . . . Daughters of Israel Relief Society, Filbert St., Mrs. M. Jonas, Treas.
- Paducah, Ky. . . . . . . . . . . Congregation Temple Israel, I. Benedict, Secty.
- Pensacola, Fla. . . . . . . . . . Congregation Beth El, Mr. Julius Menko, Secty.
- Peoria, Ill. . . . . . . . . . . . Hebrew Relief Association, Wm. F. Wollner, Pres., 437 Moss Ave.
- Philadelphia, Pa. . . . . Home for Hebrew Orphans, Meyer C. Posner, Secty., 10th and Bainbridge Sts.
- Philadelphia, Pa. . . . . The Jewish Foster Home and Orphan Asylum, Dr. Fleischman, Supt., Germantown, Pa.
- Philadelphia, Pa. . . . . Jewish Hospital, Harry N. Wessel, Secty., Stafford Bldg., 1112 Chestnut St.
- Philadelphia, Pa. . . . . The Orphans' Guardians, M. M. Getz, Secty., N. W. Cor. 15th and York Sts.
- Philadelphia, Pa. . . . . United Hebrew Charities, Max Herzberg, Pres.
- Philadelphia, Pa. . . . . Young Women's Union, Alice E. Jastrow, Cor. Secty., 1328 Montgomery Ave.; Leah Abeles, Treas., 806 N. Ninth St.

- Pine Bluff, Ark. . . . . Hebrew Relief Association, Rabbi E. Frisch, Secty.
- Pittsburg, Pa. . . . . Council of Jewish Women, Miss Pauline Block, Secty., 330 Stratford Ave.
- Pittsburg, Pa. . . . . United Hebrew Relief Association, Mr. M. Himmelmreich, Treas., 314 Fifth Ave.
- Portland, Ore. . . . . First Hebrew Benevolent Association, Solomon Blumauer, Secty., 108 Fourth St.
- Portland, Ore. . . . . Jewish Women's Benevolent Society, Mrs. Tillic Selling, Secty., 434 Main St.
- Portsmouth, Ohio. . . . . Ladies' Aid Society, Mrs. Ben Davis, Secty., Turley Bldg.
- Reading, Pa. . . . . Ladies' Hebrew Aid Society, Celia Cohn, Secty., 18 Penn Ave.
- Richmond, Va. . . . . Congregation Beth Ahabah of Richmond, Henry S. Hutzler, Secty.
- Richmond, Va. . . . . Hebrew Home for Aged and Infirm, Henry S. Hutzler, Pres.
- Richmond, Va. . . . . Hebrew Ladies' Benevolent Society, Mrs. Moses May, Treas., 607 E. Broad St.
- Rochester, N. Y. . . . . United Jewish Charities, Dr. Max Landsberg, Secty., 420 Main St., E.
- Rochester, N. Y. . . . . Jewish Orphan Asylum Association of Western New York, Dr. Max Landsberg, Secty., 420 Main St.
- Salt Lake City, Utah. Jewish Relief Society, Becky Fulop, Cor. Secty., P. O. Box 546.
- San Antonio, Tex. . . . . Montefiore Benevolent Society, Isidor Strauss, Secty.
- San Francisco, Cal. . . . Emanuel Sisterhood, Mrs. C. R. Walters, Secty., Menlo Park, Cal.
- San Francisco, Cal. . . . Hebrew Board of Relief, M. H. Levy, Secty., 1768 O'Farrel St.

- Savannah, Ga. . . . . Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Mrs. A. Vetsburg, Secty., 1611 Abercorn St.
- Scranton, Pa. . . . . Jewish Ladies' Relief Society, Mrs. Louis H. Isaacs, Secty., 717 Quincy Ave.
- Seattle, Wash. . . . . Hebrew Ladies' Benevolent Society, Mrs. I. Cooper, Secty., 1104 Minor Ave.
- Sioux City, Ia. . . . . United Hebrew Charity Association, Edward Baron, Secty.
- Sioux City, Ia. . . . . Jewish Ladies' Aid Society, Mrs. Benj. Schulcin, Secty.
- St. Joseph, Mo. . . . . Jewish Ladies' Benevolent Society, Mrs. Julius Rosenblatt, Secty., 410 W. 6th St.
- St. Louis, Mo. . . . . Jewish Charitable and Educational Union, Bernard Greensfelder, Secty., Ninth and Carr Sts.
- St. Paul, Minn. . . . . Bicker Cholem Society, Mrs. B. Mark, Pres., 589 Pine St.
- St. Paul, Minn. . . . . The Jewish Relief Society, Mrs. J. Westheimer, Rec. Secty., 846 Summit Ave.
- Stockholm, Cal. . . . . Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Belle Rosenthal, Secty., 128 E. Minor Ave.
- Syracure, N. Y. . . . . United Jewish Charities, Sol. Ferguson, Secty., 102 Walnut Place.
- Toledo, Ohio. . . . . Hebrew Ladies' Benevolent Society, Mrs. I. Hubert, Treas., 14 Seventeenth St.
- Troy, N. Y. . . . . Ladies' Society B'rith Shalom Congregation, Dr. Theo. F. Joseph, care of The Mansion House.
- Vicksburg, Miss. . . . . Associated Jewish Charities, Sol. L. Kory, Supt.
- Vicksburg, Miss. . . . . Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Mrs. M. Warnheim, 402 E. Grover St.
- Waco, Tex. . . . . The Hebrew Benevolent Society, B. Kaplan, Secty., 307 Austin Ave.

- Washington, D. C. . . . The United Hebrew Charities, Columbia Bldg., A. D. Prince, Treas., 400 Seventh St. N. W.
- Wheeling, W. Va. . . . United Hebrew Charities, Jos. Raduziner, Secty., 1103 Main St.
- Wilkes-Barre, Pa. . . . Ladies' Auxiliary, Y. W. H. A., Miss Pamela Constine, Secty., 275 S. River St.
- Wilmington, Del. . . . Hebrew Charity Association, Harry Gordon, Secty., 231 Market St.
- Youngstown, Ohio. . . . The Federated Jewish Charities, Lillie M. Guggenheim, Secty.

## Register of Delegates\*

---

Victor H. Kriegshaber, Federation of Jewish Charities, Atlanta, Ga.

Mary Caplan, Young Ladies' Benevolent Society, Baltimore, Md.

Aimée Guggenheimer, Hebrew Benevolent Society, Baltimore, Md.

Minnie S. Hanaw, Social Service in H. Sonneborn Factory, Baltimore, Md.

Prof. Jacob H. Hollander, President of Conference, Baltimore, Md.

Louis H. Levin, Federated Jewish Charities, Baltimore, Md.

Jessica B. Peixotto, University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

Dr. Isaac Sernoffsky, Federated Jewish Charities, Buffalo, N. Y.

Cecil B. Wiener, Federated Jewish Charities, Buffalo, N. Y.

Dr. David Blaustein, Chicago, Ill.

Louis M. Cahn, Jewish Aid Society, Chicago, Ill.

Saul Drucker, Mark Nathan Jewish Orphan Home, Chicago, Ill.

Rabbi J. Feuerlicht, Home for Jewish Friendless, Chicago, Ill.

Miss Rebecca L. Hefter, Chicago Women's Aid, Chicago, Ill.

Ernestine Heller, Maxwell Settlement, Chicago, Ill.

G. Hochstadter, Jewish Aid Society, Chicago, Ill.

Miriam Kalisky, Jewish Aid Society, Chicago, Ill.

Nathan D. Kaplan, Chicago, Ill.

Minnie F. Low, Bureau of Personal Service, Chicago, Ill.

Judge Julian W. Mack, Associated Jewish Charities, Chicago, Ill.

Mrs. J. B. Malkes, West Side Ladies' Charity Society, Chicago, Ill.

Jennie Mandel, Jewish Home Finding Society of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Mrs. I. J. Robbin, Jewish Consumptive Relief Society of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Luba J. Robbin, Juvenile Court, Chicago, Ill.

\* The Register of Delegates is arranged alphabetically according to city

- Corinne Rosenfeld, Associated Jewish Charities, Chicago, Ill.  
Hattie Rosenstock, Bureau of Personal Service, Chicago, Ill.  
Julius Rosenwald, Associated Jewish Charities, Chicago, Ill.  
Mrs. Henry Solomon, Jewish Aid Society, Chicago, Ill.  
Solomon L. Sulzberger, Jewish Aid Society, Chicago, Ill.  
Francis Taussig, Jewish Aid Society, Chicago, Ill.  
Dr. Boris D. Bogen, United Hebrew Charities, Cincinnati, Ohio.  
Mrs. Samuel Fletsher, United Jewish Charities, Cincinnati, Ohio.  
Simon Kuhn, United Jewish Charities, Cincinnati, Ohio.  
Louis D. Marks, United Jewish Charities, Cincinnati, Ohio.  
Max Senior, United Jewish Charities, Cincinnati, Ohio.  
Rabbi M. J. Gries, Federation of Jewish Charities, Cleveland, Ohio.  
Martin A. Marks, Federation of Jewish Charities, Cleveland, Ohio.  
Alex. S. Newman, Hebrew Relief Association, Cleveland, Ohio.  
Dr. S. Wolfenstein, Cleveland Orphan Asylum, Cleveland, Ohio.  
Meyer Friedman, Denver Sheltering Home for Jewish Children,  
Denver, Col.  
Mrs. M. Friedman, Jewish Relief Society, Denver, Col.  
Bruno Grosser, National Jewish Hospital, Denver, Col.  
Dr. C. D. Spivak, Jewish Consumptive Relief Society, Denver, Col.  
Mrs. S. Davidson, Federated Jewish Charities, Des Moines, Ia.  
Mrs. S. Levinson, Federated Jewish Charities, Des Moines, Ia.  
Rabbi E. Mannheiner, Federated Jewish Charities, Des Moines, Ia.  
Samuel Weinstock, Federated Jewish Charities, Des Moines, Ia.  
Mrs. Samuel Weinstock, Federated Jewish Charities, Des Moines,  
Ia.  
Fred. M. Butzel, United Jewish Charities, Detroit, Mich.  
Bernard Ginsberg, United Jewish Charities, Detroit, Mich.  
Blanche J. Hart, United Jewish Charities, Detroit, Mich.  
Mrs. Emma Eckhouse, Council of Jewish Women, Indianapolis,  
Ind.  
Samuel B. Kaufman, Jewish Federation, Indianapolis, Ind.  
Alfred Benjamin, United Jewish Charities, Kansas City, Mo.  
David Benjamin, United Jewish Charities, Kansas City, Mo.  
Jacob A. Billikopf, United Jewish Charities, Kansas City, Mo.  
R. S. Crohn, United Jewish Charities, Kansas City, Mo.  
Julius Davidson, United Jewish Charities, Kansas City, Mo.

- A. C. Wormser, United Jewish Charities, Kansas City, Mo.  
Garfield A. Berlinsky, Federation of Jewish Charities, Louisville,  
Ky.  
Rabbi H. G. Enclow, Federation of Jewish Charities, Louisville,  
Ky.  
Edward Grauman, Federation of Jewish Charities, Louisville, Ky.  
Mrs. E. S. Tachau, Federation of Jewish Charities, Louisville, Ky.  
E. S. Tachau, Federation of Jewish Charities, Louisville, Ky.  
Emil Nathan, United Hebrew Relief Association, Memphis, Tenn.  
Rev. Dr. M. Samfield, United Hebrew Relief Association, Memphis,  
Tenn.  
Stella A. Loeb, The Settlement, Milwaukee, Wis.  
Samuel Rabinovitch, Hebrew Relief Association, Milwaukee, Wis.  
J. H. Rubin, Remedial Loan Society, Milwaukee, Wis.  
Jonas Weil, Associated Jewish Charities, Minneapolis, Minn.  
Armand Wyle, Hebrew Orphan Asylum, Newark, N. J.  
Rabbi I. L. Leucht, Touro Infirmary and Hebrew Benevolent  
Association, New Orleans, La.  
Chester Jacob Teller, Jewish Orphan Asylum, New Orleans, La.  
Jacob Bashein, Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, New York,  
N. Y.  
David M. Bressler, Industrial Removal Office, New York, N. Y.  
Sidney E. Goldstein, Free Synagogue, New York, N. Y.  
Prof. H. L. Sabsovich, Baron de Hirsch Fund, New York, N. Y.  
Henry Solomon, Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, New York,  
N. Y.  
Cyrus L. Sulzberger, United Jewish Charities, New York, N. Y.  
Benjamin Tuska, Educational Alliance, New York, N. Y.  
Morris D. Waldman, United Hebrew Charities, New York, N. Y.  
Falk Younker, Young Men's Hebrew Association, New York, N. Y.  
Mrs. M. H. Coffee, Daughters of Israel Relief Society, Oakland,  
Cal.  
Samuel S. Fleischer, Jewish Foster Home, Philadelphia, Pa.  
Max Herzberg, United Hebrew Charities, Philadelphia, Pa.  
Rabbi Ephraim Frisch, Hebrew Relief Association, Pine Bluff,  
Ark.  
Mrs. Louis Bigelow, United Jewish Charities, Rochester, N. Y.



- Mrs. Max Landsberg, United Jewish Charities, Rochester, N. Y.  
Rabbi Max Landsberg, Jewish Orphan Asylum, Western N. Y.,  
Rochester, N. Y.
- Mrs. L. W. Wortsman, Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Savannah, Ga.
- Henry Mauser, Civic Hebrew Orphan Asylum, San Francisco, Cal.
- Mrs. Henry Mauser, Civic Hebrew Orphan Asylum, San Francisco, Cal.
- Mrs. J. R. Cohen, Hebrew Ladies' Relief Society, Scranton, Pa.
- Dr. Louis Bernstein, St. Joseph, Mo.
- Benjamin Altheimer, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Evelyn Bauman, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Montefiore Biennenstock, St. Louis, Mo.
- Mrs. H. M. Burgheim, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Mrs. Emil Caro, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Mrs. Albert Cohn, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Mrs. Henrietta Cook, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- A. C. Einstein, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Miss Regina Fischell, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Margaret Fleischman, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Moses Fraley, Jewish Educational and Charitable Union, St. Louis, Mo.
- August Frank, Jewish Educational and Charitable Union, St. Louis, Mo.
- Mrs. S. H. Frohlichstein, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- S. H. Frohlichstein, United Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.



- Jacob Furth, Cleveland Orphan Asylum, St. Louis, Mo.  
Mrs. L. Godlove, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.  
Mrs. S. D. Goldman, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.  
Bernard Greensfelder, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.  
Dr. Alex. Earle Horwitz, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.  
Mrs. J. L. Isaacs, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.  
Cordia Jenks, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.  
Mrs. Ernest Jonas, St. Louis, Mo.  
Max Kahn, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.  
Babette Kahn, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.  
Mrs. Rebecca Kahn, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.  
Flora Kober, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.  
Mrs. L. Krieger, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.  
Leah Levy, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.  
Dr. G. Lippman, St. Louis, Mo.  
Arnold Loewenstein, Y. M. H. A., St. Louis, Mo.  
Mrs. S. C. Lowenstein, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.  
Mrs. Jacob Mange, St. Louis, Mo.  
Mrs. J. Marks, Jewish Day Nursery, St. Louis, Mo.  
Emil Mayer, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.  
Rabbi H. J. Messing, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.  
Mrs. J. Michaels, St. Louis, Mo.

- Elias Michaels, Jewish Educational and Charitable Union, St. Louis, Mo.
- Mrs. Elias Michaels, Jewish Educational and Charitable Union, St. Louis, Mo.
- Jeanette Reis, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Mrs. L. P. Rothschild, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- S. Russack, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Rabbi Samuel Sale, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Mrs. M. N. Sale, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Dr. H. J. Scheick, Jewish Hospital Dispensary, St. Louis, Mo.
- Mr. S. W. Schroeder, St. Louis, Mo.
- Philip L. Seman, Supt., United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Dr. M. Silber, St. Louis, Mo.
- Mrs. Fannie Solomon, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Sidney W. Solomon, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Wm. Stix, Jewish Educational and Charitable Union, St. Louis, Mo.
- Chas. A. Stix, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Mrs. Chas. A. Stix, Selma Michael Day Nursery, St. Louis, Mo.
- Chas. H. Stix, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Miss Ray Suss, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Mrs. Meier Swopc, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Aaron Waldheim, United Jewish Educational and Charitable Association, St. Louis, Mo.
- Mrs. Jacob Wirth, Jewish Relief Society, St. Paul, Minn.
- Mrs. M. A. Bell, Toronto, Canada.

# Program

---

*Opening Session, Tuesday Evening, May 17, 8 o'clock.*

Prayer, Rev. Dr. Samuel Sale; Address of Welcome, Hon. Elias Michael; Presidential Address, Professor J. H. Hollander; Report of Transportation Committee, Judge Julian W. Mack; Report of Secretary, Louis H. Levin; Prayer, Rev. Dr. Leon Harrison.

Reception at the Columbian Club.

*Morning Session, Wednesday, May 18, 10 o'clock.*

*Subject*—DESERTION.

Reporter, Morris D. Waldman, New York.

*Discussion by*—Max Senior, Cincinnati; Benjamin Tuska, New York; A. S. Newman, Cleveland.

*Open Discussion.*

Round Table Discussion of Topics suggested by Delegates.

Lunch at the Columbian Club.

*Afternoon Session, Wednesday, May 18, 2.30 o'clock.*

*Subject*—REMOVAL WORK, INCLUDING GALVESTON.

Reporter, David M. Bressler, New York.

*Discussion by*—Cyrus L. Sulzberger, New York; Jonas Weil, Minneapolis; Rev. Ephraim Frisch, Pine Bluff; Jacob Billikopf, Kansas City.

*Open Discussion.*

*Evening Session, Wednesday, May 18, 8 o'clock.*

*Subject*—LEGAL AID.

Reporter, Minnie F. Low, Chicago, Ill.

*Discussion by*—Max B. May, Bernard Greensfelder.

*Open Discussion.*

Report of Treasurer; Report of Committee on Resolutions; Report of Committee on Nominations; Election of Officers; New Business.

---

**Program of the Section of Jewish Social Workers**

---

*Morning Session, Thursday, May 19, 10 o'clock.*

Chairman—Dr. S. Wolfenstein,

Supt. Jewish Orphan Asylum of Cleveland.

*First Paper*—“A Special Study of the Problem of Boarding Out Jewish Children and of Pensioning Widowed Mothers.”

A joint report compiled by—Mr. Solomon Lowenstein, Hebrew Orphan Asylum, New York; Mr. Morris D. Waldman, United Hebrew Charities, New York; Dr. L. B. Bernstein, Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, New York.

*Discussed by*—Dr. S. Wolfenstein, Jewish Orphan Asylum, Cleveland; Mr. Henry Mauser, Pacific Jewish Orphan Asylum, San Francisco; Mr. A. Wyle, Jewish Orphan Asylum, Newark, N. J.

*Second Paper*—“Special Education for Jewish Dependent Children, with Particular Reference to Technical and Industrial Training.”

*Paper by*—Mr. Chester J. Teller, Jewish Orphan Asylum, New Orleans.

*Discussed by*—Professor H. L. Sabsovich, Baron de Hirsch Fund, New York; Mr. Henry Woolf, Leopold Morse Home and Orphanage, Mattapan, Mass.

*Open Discussion.*

Lunch at the Columbian Club.

*Afternoon Session, Thursday, May 19, 2.30 o'clock.*

Chairman—Miss Cecil Wiener,

Supt. of Federated Jewish Charities of Buffalo, N. Y.

*First Paper*—“The Relation Between the Social Worker and His Organization.”

*Paper by*—Dr. Boris D. Bogen, United Jewish Charities, Cincinnati, Ohio.

*Discussed by*—Mr. Montefiore Bienenstock, Jewish Charitable and Educational Union, St. Louis; Dr. David Blaustein, Hebrew Institute, Chicago, Ill.

*Second Paper*—“Social Work as a Profession.”

*Paper by*—Mr. Louis H. Levin, Federated Jewish Charities, Baltimore, Md.

*Discussed by*—Rabbi Sidney E. Goldstein, Social Service Department, Free Synagogue, New York; Mr. Philip Seman, Educational Alliance, St. Louis, Mo.

*Open Discussion.*

Business Session of Section.

*Evening Session, Thursday, May 19, 10 o'clock.*

Gridiron Meeting.

Chairman—Mr. Morris D. Waldman.

Purpose—To Promote Good Will, Friendship and a Better Understanding Among the Social Workers.

## Proceedings

---

Tuesday, May 17, 1910.

The Sixth Biennial Session of the National Conference of Jewish Charities held its first meeting, Tuesday evening, May 17, 1910, in the hall of the Columbian Club of St. Louis, President Hollander in the chair.

PRESIDENT HOLLANDER: The meeting will please be in order.

### PRAYER.

RABBI SAMUEL SALE, St. Louis: All-merciful and most-gracious Father, we ask Thy blessing and implore Thy guidance in all the tasks and toils of our earthly pilgrimage. Be with us now in this solemn and sacred convocation, when Thy servants are assembled to do Thy bidding, to hearken to Thy voice, calling us to worship Thee in the service of humanity. Oh, kindle, we pray Thee, in the hearts of our generation the altar-flame of devotion to that ancient faith of our fathers, whose imperishable ideals of justice, righteousness and love are being impressed deeper and deeper upon the consciousness of enlightened mankind; make us deeply sensible of those obligations that rest upon us as children of the house, which in Thy promise is destined to become a house of prayer for all peoples, and as the disciples of the prophets who were the first to proclaim these exalted truths. We ask Thee to strengthen us that we may heed the message of Thine ancient servants, speaking to us now more fervently than ever before of the sacred inheritance, which mankind, as our kith and kin, must some day come to share with us, and that, as a part of our daily lives and worship, we may practise its lessons, to loose the shackles of iniquity, to undo the bonds of injustice, to let the oppressed go free, to break our bread to the hungry, and bring the groaning poor into the comfort and shelter of our own homes, to be eyes to the blind and hands and feet to the halt and the lame. May Thy spirit prevail in all our deliberations; the spirit of wisdom and

understanding, the spirit of counsel and strength, the spirit of knowledge and the fear of Thee. And now may the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us, and may He establish the work of our hands. Amen!

#### ADDRESS OF WELCOME.

The address of welcome was then delivered by the Hon. Elias Michael of St. Louis.

HON. ELIAS MICHAEL, St. Louis: It is a privilege and a pleasure to welcome you and bring to you a message of cordial greeting from the citizens of St. Louis, whom you have honored by selecting their city for this year's meeting. The cause which brings you together is one of self-sacrifice. You have come from far and near, without regard to the urgent calls of your own affairs, to confer and learn from each other's experiences how to better grapple with the many problems presented by those unfortunates who, through stress of circumstances, look to others for help. And there is no service like his that serves because he loves.

We have our Doctors of Divinity, Doctors of Law, Doctors of Medicine, of Philosophy, all the arts and sciences, honors and degrees for the learned in almost every direction of human wisdom and endeavor. We are now beginning to recognize that the greatest study of all is human nature. Sociology has become one of the foremost sciences of the day. Formerly fevers and other ills were treated by cupping and leeching. We took from those we sought to help, their life's blood. If the patient survived it was because of a constitution that withstood the sapping away of his vitality and strength. The treatment of the poor and improvident has changed as greatly as the treatment of the sick. Ameliorating the condition of the poverty-stricken is not to weaken, but to invigorate. The almoner who doles out with a callous hand and unsympathetic heart and shrivels and destroys manhood and self-respect has given way to the trained philanthropist, whose trend of thought is how to minimize and prevent pauperism and its debasing consequences. To instil hope that the future has something in it to live for and aspire to.



The fundamental purpose of philanthropy is the conservation of the resources of human beings, to assist those who are groping in the dark, or, owing to economic conditions, or to their physical, moral or mental feebleness, are losing their hold in the struggle for existence.

Our government is giving much thought and expending vast sums for the conservation of the material resources of the country, but leaves to individual effort, and to organizations like yours, the greatest of its most valuable assets, its human beings, those who, but for you, would suffer the tortures of despair and become embittered against all society. You hold that the unfortunate, instead of being treated as blameworthy outcasts, are entitled to our deep sympathy. You recognize not alone physical needs, but also opportunity for development, encouragement of thrift, and the instilling of ambition for nobler and better things.

Religion is advancing, and has taken on a new direction. The singing of psalms and the observance of ceremonials do not so strongly appeal to those who have learned there is a great joy in serving our fellow-man, and that personal sacrifice has in its practice a greater elation of heart and mind than the preaching of dogma. Formerly we gave alms as a saving grace. Now we recognize our responsibility for our fellow-man as a duty, and we feel we must give of ourselves to help others.

Roosevelt in a recent address said: "The average citizen must be a good citizen if our republics are to succeed," and you aim to raise the level of our average citizenship and so strengthen our body politic. Your conferences have developed a broader conception of the responsibilities confronting modern society. You demonstrate that mind, morals and physical welfare are responsive to sympathy and devotion, and that as long as the divine flame of a wish for better things exists in the human breast there is a hope for all living beings, no matter to what depths they may have fallen, or to what extent their sufferings have undermined their power of recuperation. And as you work out a successful treatment for specific cases you also establish a standard to benefit generations to come.



Some of the questions that confront you are owing to persecution and prejudice peculiar to our co-religionists. You have to contend with the ignorance of our customs, institutions and laws, and, in addition to the questions of poverty, morality and disease, you also have the great and serious questions of socialism and citizenship to take into consideration. Modern democracy and modern conception have given to Jewish philanthropy many new functions of vital importance, and the responsibility for our fellow-man does not end with care for his physical comfort, but, owing to race and religion, we are made responsible for his standing as a citizen.

The greatest minds of our day preach service to our fellow-man, good will, love and sympathy for all human beings, as the religion of the future. You, men and women, who are giving yourselves to that great work, must feel like the High Priests of old, that yours is truly a sacred calling. May your ministrations bring light to dark places and radiate happiness and contentment where misery and want abound. You are busy people devoted to your cause and imbued with a keen desire to advance the good work in which you are engaged. In your devotion you have taken from our citizens the privilege they craved of extending certain courtesies. Your officers have seen fit to curtail the program we laid out for your entertainment, which is only another evidence of your intense zeal and devotion to the work which brings you here. The consciousness of work well done must be a great comfort to you. If you needed any assurance that your efforts are appreciated look to the great and ready response to your calls for support. Never in the history of the world has there been such a wave of generous and hearty giving as in recent giving, and this must be in a large degree due to the knowledge that the supplies are well dispensed.

I know I voice the sentiment of every St. Louisan in saying that we are proud of your selection.

We welcome you with an open heart and earnest wishes that your stay may be pleasant, and that an all-wise Providence may guide your deliberations so that your conclusions will bear good fruit and humanity in ages to come will call blessings upon you.

The presidential address was then delivered by the President, Professor J. H. Hollander (Baltimore).

#### PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS.

The ordinary purpose of a president's address to an assembled membership is to review the notable occurrences transpiring in the field with which those to whom it is addressed are concerned, during the interval elapsing since the preceding meeting.

If I depart somewhat from this practice, so happily exemplified in the deliverances of my distinguished predecessors, it is in no underestimate of what has happened since we were assembled in Richmond two years ago. A more imperious summons to social betterment, a larger response in service and resource, a greater efficiency in purpose and method—these are but some of the notable achievements of the term just ended.

It has seemed to me, however, that at this Sixth Biennial Conference, marking as it does a decade of existence, an independent course might be taken, and that instead of reviewing actual performance I might indulge in wider range, taking account in retrospect, in survey and forecast, not so much of facts and events, but of forces and tendencies.

Looking back in this spirit upon the progress of charitable effort, and peculiarly of Jewish charitable effort within the ten years of the Conference's life, one cannot fail to be sensible of a great change that has come about. Different things are being done—they are being done in a different manner and a different class of people are engaged in doing them. I can sum up the transformation—for it is hardly less—in no better way than by saying that charity has tended to become less benevolent and more beneficent—there is less well-wishing and there is very much more well-doing.

This is as it should be. A commonplace of social philosophy describes human improvements as the progress of rationalism. Other forces have large play—environment, native endowment, religious and ethical ideals—but, in the main, societies have advanced to enlightenment and altruism at even pace with the arrest of impulse by thought and the domination of emotion by reasoned judgment.

From the very nature of things the field of social betterment has been late in feeling this new control. It was almost yesterday that one spoke of charity and reason as of things as much opposed as feeling and thought, faith and demonstration.

But, more and more, those who have been concerned with the work, and even the larger number who inspire and support it, have realized that social effort—the endeavor to improve the material well-being of fellow-men—is subject to the same laws and must pursue the same methods that guide wisely expended energy in other directions. Any other course is waste and misdirection, at best failing to realize maximum efficiency, at worst doing irrefutable injury to subject and agent.

It is this which we mean in speaking of philanthropy having become scientific, and of social endeavor grown rationalized. I use the terms “scientific” and “rational,” but all that they imply is quite as well expressed by the homelier term “common sense.” Charitable activity within the last ten years has simply become more sane and intelligent. The dominant sense of the community has inclined less and less to regard misery and suffering with a placid fatalism as final conditions, which we would always have with us and as to which remedial effort is but a semi-emotional indulgence dictated by religious impulse and rewarded by conscious self-approval. But, instead, poverty has come to be increasingly understood as a social disorder—as definite as alcoholism or anæmia, due to specific conditions and influences, which may be traced with the precision and accuracy of a pathological diagnosis, and which impose upon the charity giver the responsibility of making or of profiting by this inquiry as the precedent to his act.

Out of this general change in spirit have grown the characteristic features of present-day philanthropy—organization, federation, expert training, case investigation, preventive work and personal service.

Some of this has to do merely with externals, and here there is little room for difference of opinion. No hard-headed man of affairs will, for a moment, contend that a charitable organization—hospital, orphan asylum, or relief society—should not be officered by a personnel as efficient as the working force of his own counting-

room or factory. Be the work what it may, some *one* is better suited for its performance than some *other*, and effective organization means simply that the selection of presidents, of secretaries and of directive boards should be upon the basis of peculiar fitness and distinctive ability, instead of communal honor or genteel pensioning.

So in the matter of federation. Instead of a dozen independent organizations competing for patrons and clients, wearing out the resources of the community with indifferent results, the application of sound business principles has established a federated working body, assessing upon the community the cost of its social burdens with directness and economy, husbanding the resources thus derived and exercising in the name of the collective interest a rational sway over individual efforts in a manner that means guidance without interference.

But it is in the inner content that the really vital change in charitable effort has come about. Any man of affairs would scoff at the thought that there could be anything out of joint in his business without a specific cause or complex of causes being responsible. He would be equally clear that the proper course for him to pursue would be to ascertain just what was causing the trouble, even though this search involved effort, time, money and expert service. He would do nothing whatever except perhaps to apply a temporary check until the real cause had been disclosed, and then his remedial treatment would be direct, thoroughgoing and effective.

In all this he would apply to his business the methods of science, even though he would, perhaps, like the prose-speaking bourgeois of Molière's comedy, be startled and dismayed to know that he was doing it, for, after all, scientific method is nothing more than that procedure which long experience and repeated trial have established as the quickest and surest method of accomplishing desired ends. Its essence is briefly that every condition is due to some cause, and that, therefore, to remedy the condition, first ascertain the cause and thereafter apply the appropriate remedy. It is the manner in which the modern physician studies his patient, makes his diagnosis and prescribes a curative, instead of letting

blood on general principles as he would a few generations ago, or burning incense to offended fetishes as he might have done as many thousand years before.

To assert then that charitable effort has within the last decade become increasingly scientific and rationalized has in it nothing new or mysterious, no technical apparatus nor complicated terminology. It is simply to reiterate that a very much larger proportion than ever before of the persons who feel the impulse to philanthropic effort act on the principle that every claimant for relief, every case of dependence, every occasion for social betterment is what it is in consequence of certain definite conditions, and that it is appropriate and necessary to ascertain with precision what is the particular cause in question and to administer treatment in the light of this discovery.

I realize, of course, that everything I have said has the familiarity almost of a social platitude, but this very fact is perhaps the most convincing evidence of what I am trying to suggest, namely, the tremendous progress of the past decade, whereby so essentially modern a concept as this scientific or common-sense view of philanthropy has already the hackneyed intimacy of an economic commonplace.

Of course, much more than ten years ago the claim of rationalism in philanthropy was heard, but the advocacy was faint and the propaganda unpopular. There was still much of the old twaddle that a man's charity was a matter of his own heart, that he ought to give when, where and to whom he felt he ought, and that he could no more have someone else do this for him than secure a substitute in religion or a proxy in matrimony. But this stage has been safely left behind us. No one today seriously maintains that he can righteously warm the cockles of his heart by giving relief without being certain that it is relief, any more than he can feed quinine pills to a child because he happens to have a vial in his pocket and the tiny pellets appeal to the infantile eye.

In so far charity has passed from the uncertainty of an emotional impulse and attained the dignity of a rational judgment. Benevolence continues to furnish the mainspring, but beneficence guides the course. Philanthropy moves on a distinctly higher plane.



Poverty is an economic consequence, not a social necessity—remedial, even preventable, not by panacea or upheaval, but by unerring determination of causes and devoted application of correctives.

An inspiring vista thus stands revealed to those who love mankind, and will labor for its betterment. Not by prayer shall misery and suffering cease, but by work through truth. First, "why"—then, "how." Here indeed the knowledge that is power—the truth that will set men free.

In this decade of notable progress Jewish philanthropy has taken a creditable part. Its velocity, if I may use the analogy to suggest relative improvement, has been, if anything, greater than that of non-Jewish effort, and, considered absolutely, it has effected substantial social gains. Indeed, in matters of organization and administration we have led the van by a gratifying priority. In my own community, and I am sure the example has its counterpart in many other cities, a distinct fillip has been given to the organization—administrative and fiscal—of non-Jewish charities by the really notable results achieved by the Jewish organizations, through the application of skilled intelligence and thoroughgoing business methods.

At this point further consideration of the matter is met by a very proper challenge: If Jewish philanthropy forms an integral part of the larger movement for social betterment, why should there be occasion for a distinctive study by Jews of Jewish charity? What is the warrant for the existence of a National Conference of Jewish Charities in contradistinction to the greater body that is to assemble here in a few days? Jewish charity, as ordinarily understood, means the administration of relief largely to Jewish dependents, of resources made available in the main by Jews, and administered through the agency of Jewish workers. Either this segregated discussion is a phase of an unwholesome clannishness, or the charitable problems with which we, as Jews, are concerned are in many respects peculiar and distinctive.

No one who has enjoyed, as most of us have, the dual experience of participating in Jewish charitable activity, on the one hand, and what may, for convenience, be called non-Jewish movements

of parallel intent, on the other, will hesitate for a moment to assert that the problems of Jewish dependence are, and for a long time will probably continue to be, different in their most important aspects, not merely in degree, but in kind, from the subject matter of general philanthropy.

It is not merely that those with whom our work lies are in the main alien in speech and in nationality. American philanthropy is too largely concerned with the foreign-born and the foreign-speaking for this to necessitate independent organization. Nor is difference in religion, considered as a doctrinal faith, sufficient warrant for our separatist attitude. The social worker rarely finds embarrassment in the fact that those with whom he is engaged are of a different creed from his own, and indeed it may be questioned whether the identity of religious affiliation does not more often embarrass than aid in developing in the mind of the beneficiary an expectation of a special dispensation.

The real occasion for distinct treatment of Jewish dependents lies in the historical conditions under which the Jewish type has been evolved in its mental, physical and moral aspects.

The Jew, and particularly the Jew who claims our attention in the work of social betterment, is the product of a distinctive environment. He has grown up under conditions which tended either to impair his physical development or at least to discourage its improvement, which confined his economic activities largely to parasitic vocations; which hedged him in a communal solidarity away from outer contacts; which taught him to regard necessary relief as his right, and to tolerate his delinquencies with a good-natured indulgence. In a flash, all of this changed—a strange entourage, a different industrial organization, the old communal ties dissolved—new standards, new ideals, new sanctions.

To a very unusual degree, the Jewish dependent is thus a socio-economic consequence. Over and above the ordinary influences responsible for social problems a special group of forces have been at work here.

It is doubtful whether any but a Jew can fully understand, and it is certain that none but a Jew can adequately appreciate what these forces are and how fundamental their effect. I sometimes

think "das jüdische Herz" was not a thing of the heart, but of the head—an expression less of a warmer pity for need than the outcome of a clearer conception of how the need had arisen.

This then is the essential need for a distinct ministration of social relief to Jews by Jews, and the prime warrant for an independent study of the problem in all its phases by those who are immediately concerned therewith. It is only a more complete carrying out of that rational tendency which has brought us to where we now are—full determination of the causes of distress and application of the most appropriate remedies by the most efficient agents. Since it is only the Jew who by virtue of subtle *Gefühl*—historic identity, race consciousness or religious brotherhood—can become fully cognizant of the special circumstances which have contributed to Jewish dependence, it is therefore primarily the Jew who should assume the problem of Jewish relief, and in anticipation of his responsibility should deliberate as to procedure.

But in all this an independent course is not a separatist one. The Jewish charity worker will keep in touch with all betterment work in the general social field; he will lend his counsels to their discussion, and he will avail himself in his own work of the conclusions safely reached. But he will not stop with this. His subject matter is the same and yet more. His deliberations will take account of the distinctive elements of his peculiar *clientèle*, and his practical activities will represent the general rules of action amended, modified or supplemented in the light of those further considerations which he is obliged to entertain.

So pursued, the study of Jewish philanthropy may be expected to give us increasingly efficient service. But is it too much to hope that an even larger result will follow? Just as the work of social betterment carried on by Jews among Jews has felt the stimulus and uplift of social activity in the general field, so now in turn it will exert a reflex action and bear back upon non-Jewish charities the impress of its distinctive virtues. I have already intimated that in one aspect at least—fiscal and administrative organization—such a contribution had been made, and realized. But surely larger things are yet to come! From the beginning



the essence of Jewish charity has been the improvement of one's fellow-men. Like civic virtue and moral decency, charity is to the Jew an integral part of the normal life; not a thing to be put on or put off at will, but an organic phase of human conduct. If man would live well and do righteousness he must see to it that those about him fail not—in so far as he can prevent—in at least the chance to attain material well-being. The conception of the man who gives charity—and gives it wisely, for otherwise it is not charity—as merely the righteous man, and of him who gives it not as immoral—is the contribution which the Jew must make to the world's philanthropy.

PRESIDENT HOLLANDER: We are signally honored by the presence this evening, as the guest of the Conference, of one who not by office and rank alone, but by spiritual force and intellectual equipment, is easily chief amongst all enlisted in the cause of social improvement. I say as "the guest of the Conference," but surely, if sympathy and helpfulness count for anything, she is not only with us, but of us. I esteem it the greatest privilege to present this lady—whom we, whom all enlightened mankind rejoice to honor, citizen of no one commonwealth, but of that larger republic whose franchise is fellow-love and whose goal is brotherhood—Miss Jane Addams.

GREETINGS FROM NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CHARITIES AND  
CORRECTIONS.

MISS JANE ADDAMS, Chicago: It gives me much pleasure to be present at this meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Charities as the representative of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, and to bring the greetings of that body to this fine Conference of Jewish Charities.

I think that it is also appropriate that the National Conference should somewhat officially make this recognition, because anyone who is acquainted with the progress of charities and philanthropic undertakings realizes how much they owe both in experimentation and methods of organization to Jewish Charities.

Only today one of your members told me of the efforts made in Chicago to board dependent children with their own mothers, which I welcomed as a pioneer attempt to break into that wretched delusion that a woman can both support and nurture her children.

One of the most piteous revelations of its futility came to me through the mother of "Goosie," as the children for years called a little boy who, because he was brought to the Hull House nursery wrapped up in his mother's shawl, always had his hair filled with the down and small feathers from the feather brush factory where she worked. One March morning, Goosie's mother was hanging out the washing on a shed roof at six o'clock, doing it thus early before she left for the factory. Five-year-old Goosie was trotting at her heels, handing her clothespins, when he was suddenly blown off the roof by the high wind into the alley below. His neck was broken by the fall and, as he lay piteous and limp on a pile of frozen refuse, his mother cheerily called to him to "climb up again," so confident do overworked mothers become that their children cannot get hurt. After the funeral, as the poor mother sat in the nursery postponing the moment when she must go back to her empty rooms, I asked her, in a futile effort to be of comfort, if there was anything more we could do for her. The overworked, sorrow-stricken woman looked up and, with unwonted energy in her voice, replied, "If you could give me my wages for tomorrow, I would not go to work in the factory at all. I would like to stay at home and hold the baby. Goosie was always asking me to take him and I never had any time." This statement revealed the condition of many nursery mothers who are obliged to forego the joys and solaces which are supposed to belong to even the most poverty-stricken. The long hours of factory labor necessary for earning the support of a child leave little time for caressing.

With all the efforts made by modern society to nurture and educate the young, how stupid it is to permit the mothers of young children to spend themselves in the coarser work of the world! It is curiously inconsistent with the emphasis which this generation has placed upon the prolongation of infancy that we constantly allow the waste of this most precious material.

I have used this illustration, which comes to me at the moment, of the advanced case of dependent children, because it is typical of the wider scope which this movement of the Jewish charities represents and constantly demonstrates to the rest of it. With equal force this wider scope might have been illustrated from other of free undertakings. May I close with a message of congratulation and good wishes for the National Body.

## REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION.

JUDGE JULIAN W. MACK, Chicago: The Committee has no formal report to offer, but I can perhaps say something briefly, something on the general subject.

Professor Hollander has given us in his splendid address a sound philosophical basis, not only for separate Jewish charities, but for this National Conference of the organizations.

The considerations which led to its establishment, however, were of a more practical nature, and they had to do with this question of transportation. It had become the miserable practice of many communities to get rid of their dependents by shipping them elsewhere, by foisting them upon other communities, upon which they had no claim; and even this was not done in a half-way decent manner, because it was a little too expensive to send the applicant to the final destination that he or she wanted to reach, whether justified in going there or not. So one community would ship the family a hundred miles and put them as a burden on that community, and the second would pick them up and ship them another hundred miles and drop them as a burden on the third community, and so on, until somehow or other the family reached its destination, only to become dependent upon the last community. And too often this last community was a health resort or a small town which perhaps had few Jewish inhabitants, but the climate was favorable to disease, and too often the misguided victims of this so-called charity reached their destination totally unfit, totally unable to be cured of their disease—there only to die.

The result was an injury to the victims, an injury to the other community, the impoverishment of every city that indulged in

that practice for the benefit of the railways. The prime purpose of this organization was to introduce a change, to bring about a spirit of co-operation, and to the end to formulate regulations which should become binding upon every constituent member of the National Body, and which would prevent a continuance of these practices.

The fundamental spirit of these rules was that no inhabitant should be assisted to be sent to some other city unless that other city ought to receive him; unless he had somebody there who would be responsible for him; unless work was at hand for him at the city of his destination. If he was a dependent, home was the place wherein he ought to remain during dependency; if, however, the home city believed he could be made self-supporting elsewhere, then it was its duty not to make him a burden on another community, but to maintain him until he should become self-supporting.

I am happy to report that the spirit of those regulations has been lived up to in such a splendid manner that since your last Conference but six cases have been presented for arbitration to this committee.

May I say that the Committee is equally happy to report that its conclusions have been accepted in spite of the threat made by some cities that if the decision went against them they would feel it incumbent upon them to withdraw from the Conference?

The work for which this National Conference was primarily created will, however, not be completely done until we have as members of the Conference every Jewish charitable organization in the country.

May I add a few words on a subject somewhat connected with this subject of transportation—the subject of immigration. I said that practical considerations had brought about this National Conference. There are practical considerations as well as the deeper underlying one so beautifully set forth by Professor Hollander that demand the continuation of Jewish charities, and the principal of these has to do with the problem of immigration.

It is not only a Jewish problem; it is a great American problem, and we are interested in it not only as Jews, but as Americans.

It is one of the most important problems before the people. Under President Roosevelt, a commission was appointed to make a thorough study of immigration. That committee has been at work for the past three years and will render its report to Congress probably next December. During this time many efforts have been made to narrow the American immigration laws, to raise up the barrier against the immigrant.

Now I conceive it to be our duty to confront this problem, thoughtfully, from the standpoint of what is to the best interests of the United States. Certainly I personally am convinced, and no one who will read the report of the hearing before the House Committee on Immigration on the 11th day of March of this year, participated in by prominent Jews—no one, I say, with an open mind who will read the argument that these men made but will be convinced that America cannot afford to lose the million or more immigrants who are coming here each year; that we need the immigrant, as we have always needed the immigrant, for the development and the good of this country. In the report of that hearing you will find completely refuted every one of the arguments that are being brought forward by the restrictionists in favor of raising up barriers against the immigrant.

Among those arguments I conceive of none sounder than this: That much as we need the immigrant for the material and economic development of this country, and particularly for our great uninhabited West, still more do we need particularly that class of immigrant in which we as Jews are primarily interested—the victims of political and religious prejudices. For, while I am firmly convinced that no people on the face of the earth is more full of real fundamental idealism than the people of this country, nevertheless, much as we need the material value that the immigrant is to this country, still more do we and every other nation need that tremendous increased idealism that is brought to us by the men and the women who are ready to sacrifice property and liberty and life itself rather than give up their religious and political principles. It is for these people particularly that we want to keep the barriers down and the gates open. And how can



we best contribute to this work, a work which, I am firmly convinced, spells increased prosperity and happiness for our country?

One of the dangers that confront us is this: The immigrants, and particularly our poor Jewish immigrants, driven out of their homes in Russia by a despot, almost crushed, all of their property taken away from them, come here empty-handed, without knowledge of our language, without knowledge of our customs. Of course, many of them in the beginning are dependent and need a helping hand. The danger is this, however: If they become a burden upon the general community so as to cause an increase in taxation for philanthropic purposes, many and many a man, feeling the pressure on his pocket-book, will forget the fundamental principles of American liberty, will forget the great amount of good these immigrants are to bring us, and, remembering only his financial loss, will raise the cry which finds many ready followers: "Let's keep them all out!"

Even if they do not become burdens upon the tax rates of the community at large, even if they become burdens upon the general Jewish philanthropies, this feeling will be aroused, and in the arousing of it there is danger that the American people will be misled.

It is up to us, as Jews and as Americans, to see to it that our people do not cause this feeling to arise. There is only one way in which we can do it, and that is by seeing that the helping hand that they may need is extended by us, and that we open up our pocket-books whenever it is needed to keep them from becoming charges upon the community.

When Jews came to New York over two hundred and fifty years ago, the obligation was legally placed upon them and they gave legal pledges that their people should not become a burden upon the community. That legal pledge no longer exists. Our immigrants have the same claim on the humanity of America as all other people. But we owe the duty not only to them, we owe the duty to ourselves to see to it that what we consider right shall prevail in this country, and we can best promote this by keeping up our Jewish philanthropies for the benefit primarily of the newcomers.

The purely philosophic reasons which Professor Hollander has given would justify the continuation of our Jewish charities. But these practical considerations make it absolutely essential, not only that they be maintained, but that every man among us give to his utmost to their support in every possible way. We owe this to our fellow-Jews because their oppression is due solely to their religious beliefs and observances. And as long as there is on the face of the earth one who by professing our religion thereby becomes the victim of oppression and abuse it behooves us to stand up for him, and, with all of our strength, to battle for our faith, our brothers and ourselves. Our obligations however do not end here. As true Jews, we owe a duty to all humanity. This we must pay by our contributions not only in money, but in personal work for all philanthropic activities, and therefore we shall delight in taking part not only in this National Conference of Jewish Charities, but also in the great National Conference of Charities and Corrections, whose sessions will soon begin in this city.

PRESIDENT HOLLANDER: The report of the Secretary will be presented by Mr. Louis H. Levin, of Baltimore.

#### SECRETARY'S REPORT.

SECRETARY LEVIN: Upon assuming office, directly after the last Conference held in Richmond in 1908, I made a study of the field of organized Jewish charities for the purpose of ascertaining the name and number of the organizations which ought to be members of the National Conference of Jewish Charities, but were not affiliated with our organization. Using the American Jewish Year Book of that year as a source of information, I found 374 organizations in 46 States and territories, which, from the scant information in the Year Book, appeared as possible members of this Conference. They included, of course, many organizations not conducted by so-called American or German Jews. Indeed, I believe the majority of them could be so classified. Particularly to be noted were the Haehnosas Orchim, or Friendly Inns, and the Gemillath Chasodim, or Free Loan Societies, which exist, in almost every city. These are organizations, and important or-

ganizations of recent growth, practically unrepresented in our membership, and it was deemed desirable that their cohesion be secured. Friendly Inns are not local societies, for they affect in a most pronounced manner the problem of Jewish transients, and tramps, and therefore come peculiarly within the sphere of our work. With the possible exception of the relief society, with its intricate inter-municipal complications, no character of institution has a less local sphere of influence than the Friendly Inn. In spite of a campaign amongst them by mail, only one such institution has joined our ranks, namely, the Hachnosas Orchim of Kansas City; but the beginning has been made, and to that association belongs the honor of first recognizing the national character of the work the Friendly Inns do.

Hebrew Free Loan Associations are local affairs, even so large and active an association as the Hebrew Free Loan Association of New York, a member of this Conference, operates in its own city, and it may not seem, at first glance, as if this Conference has any attraction for them. This calls up the larger question, whether associations, limited in operations to the cities to which they belong, have a duty to become members of this Conference. I venture to express the opinion that it would be narrowing the scope and value of the Conference to limit it to such associations as have relations with organizations in other cities, that is, those whose operations have an inter-municipal character. The rules for the regulation of transportation are not our charter or sole excuse for existence. On the contrary, the meeting here this evening demonstrates that Jewish charities, whether local or national, have problems of their own, which can best be studied in gatherings of this sort, where mind meets mind, worker confronts worker, and questions are stated and answered with the combined wisdom of numbers who have puzzled over the same inquiries.

With this idea of the sweep of our Conference in mind, the campaign was directed toward institutions of all kinds, and an attempt was made to convince them that the more representative the National Conference the greater use it would be to all concerned. We did not hesitate to approach hospitals and homes and



orphan asylums with the plea that the Conference forms the great Jewish forum to which any question concerning charitable or social work might be brought. The replies have not been so numerous nor so encouraging as we had hoped, though the membership has been increased twenty per cent. It was to be expected that the newer associations, especially those which conduct their affairs in Yiddish, should hesitate before joining us; but the campaign of education, the extension of the idea of organization, has to be carried on for years before it bears fruit, and the hope is here expressed that a modest beginning has been made.

Besides letters written to prospective members, lists of our membership, our transportation rules, our constitution, a telegraphic code and, finally, a copy of the report of the proceedings of 1908 were distributed to prospective members, and it is not too much to believe that the name and purpose of the Conference have been carried into quarters where they were unknown before. Quite a number of replies were received, showing that our invitation was seriously considered, and if the answer finally inclined against us it was, let us assume, because the real value of the Conference has not made itself felt among the less conspicuous associations.

When the last Conference adjourned we had, according to the record submitted to me by my predecessor, 116 members, of whom 10 had lapsed, and from whom no dues have been received since 1908, and from even before that time. These 106 members were down for dues amounting to \$1,097, the 10 lapsed members for \$50. During the last two years, we have succeeded in obtaining the adhesion of 22 new members contributing \$300 per annum, making a total now of 128 societies in good standing, contributing \$1,347 annually. The new organizations are:

Jewish Home Society, Albany, N. Y.

Associated Jewish Charities, Chicago, Ill.

Hebrew Ladies' Relief, Dayton, O.

Detroit Ladies' Society for Support of Widows and Orphans.

Beth Israel Benevolent Society, Houston, Tex.

Independent Jewish Charities, Milwaukee, Wis.

Ladies' Sanitary and Benevolent Society, Milwaukee, Wis.

Hebrew Immigration Society, New York, N. Y.

Montefiore Home, New York, N. Y.  
Jewish Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.  
Hebrew Home for Aged, Richmond, Va.  
Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Stockton, Cal.  
Hebrew Benevolent Loan, Buffalo, N. Y.  
Chicago Women's Aid.  
Denver Sheltering Home.  
Hachnosas Orchim, Kansas City, Mo.  
Ladies' Relief Sewing Society, Milwaukee, Wis.  
Mt. Sinai Hospital, Milwaukee, Wis.  
Ladies' Fuel and Aid Society, New York, N. Y.  
New York Orphan Asylum.  
Council Jewish Women, Pittsburg, Pa.  
United Hebrew Charities, Sioux City, Ia.

There has been some inquiry as to whether the dues could not be so rearranged as to be divided more acceptably among the membership. Suggestions of a reduction have been offered, and, on the other hand, individual in addition to organization membership has been urged. I shall not go into these various questions here, but it may not be out of place to show that any reduction in our income would be unwise.

What are our funds used for? In the first place, to pay the expense of running the office, then reporting the Conference and publishing its proceedings in substantial book form. The Conference had a traveling scholarship, awarded several years ago, but that has been discontinued, and there is no disposition to continue to appropriate for this purpose. Of course, expense is incurred in making propaganda for the Conference, and in extending its membership and influence. Finally, our transportation decisions have been printed and distributed during the last two years, and the importance of this procedure should not be overlooked. When I assumed office, I found that it had not been the practice heretofore to print or preserve decisions, and that the only members knowing of a rule laid down or a principle established on the basis of an adjudicated case were those involved in the dispute. No precedents could be established under this system, and it was a matter of difficulty for the Transportation

Committee itself to recall the facts that they had previously passed on, and the decision that they had made.

Recognizing that in establishing a sound practice in regard to inter-municipal affairs, the Conference would perform positive and constructive work, as soon as questions were propounded to the Transportation Committee, we put them in shape for permanent record, and the decisions were distributed to all the members of the Conference. While the questions passed upon were not numerous, they were of considerable importance, and one case involved the payment by one city of a large sum to another city. The city that made the payment deserves credit for its prompt acquiescence in the decision of the Committee, and the no less prompt payment of a considerable sum, when behind the decision was only the moral force of the general agreement on which members enter the Conference. There is every prospect that the Committee will be called upon more often in the future to render decision between member and member, for it will be evident that our rules have been made to be observed, and that it is worth while for every organization to heed them itself and to see that its neighbor does likewise.

I must restrain my desire to enter into an exposition of the activities that might profitably be undertaken by the Conference, but my short term in office has demonstrated to me that we have not made full use of the fact that this is an organization of organizations and not of individuals. Organizations are interested, for instance, in desertion, which is, in nearly every instance, a tale of two or more cities, and a central bureau for gathering and disseminating facts about deserters, with their description and photographs, would probably be of great assistance in meeting this unmanageable evil. Only a national organization could run such a bureau, and ours is the only Jewish national charitable association. Other lines might be mentioned in which the National Conference could be of great use in helping to solve the problems of its constituent societies. This, again, raises the question whether we are only a conference, with no duties beyond meeting and discussing. Our Transportation Committee is a step

away from that point of view, and it is a matter for consideration whether we should not go further in this direction.

Whether we do or not, we ought at least to have a central office, with some stability both as to location and manager. Heretofore the Secretary has had control of the office, and there is no reason why he should not be continued in that capacity. But I doubt the wisdom of frequent changes in this office, as the work loses in continuity with the advent of a new Secretary, as I can testify, and all that has been done by previous secretaries in getting the Conference in running order, in establishing rules and regulations, in ascertaining the particular needs of our various kinds of institutions, is lost. Not only should my successor be selected with the view to maintaining him in the position indefinitely, but some salary, a modest one, perhaps only a nominal salary, as only a fraction of his time will be needed, should be attached to the office, which ought to be regarded professionally, and not merely as voluntary service, over which all other engagements take precedence. At the last Conference the Executive Committee was authorized to engage a field secretary if it deemed such action wise; but it is my humble opinion that a paid secretary, who should follow up our work and obtain a good grasp on our affairs would be a much more useful adjunct to our Conference.

The office ought to have a better control over information regarding constituent members. All reports issued by them ought to be kept on file, as well as other information that may be helpful to members. The office could be made a clearing house for inquiries and information of many kinds, connected with the work of our members, and could in that way become a center of use and help. I repeat that it may be a matter of considerable doubt whether the Conference ought to strike out in the domain of actual work, or whether it should remain more or less a shell, as it is now, with enough flexibility to accommodate all shades of opinion, and with duties which, while responsible, are not particularly troublesome. I submit, however, that the Conference extension work that I have suggested at least merits consideration. And whether there is extension or not, the Secretary's office should be taken more seriously. Perhaps it will be apparent now that

the undiminished income of the Conference will be required to obtain a proper standard of efficiency.

In planning for the future, the present Yiddish or Anglo-Yiddish societies should not be overlooked, for though they are for the most part small, in the aggregate their work bulks large, and tomorrow they will be English, influential and up to date. We can understand perfectly why the idea of national organization has not taken better root among them. They lack something of our *savoir faire*, they have not, except in a few instances, attained successful local organization, our aims and purposes have not been placed before them convincingly, and our proceedings are not intelligible to large masses of their contributors. Perhaps, too, we have not invited them as cordially as we might have done. There is sufficient evidence that the feeling for organization and organization on a comprehensive scale is growing, and the situation presents distinct elements of hope. Social workers are being more and more recruited from among those who understand Yiddish and the Yiddish Jew, and to them we may look for effective assistance in adding to our strength an element that has not been drawn upon largely in the past for our purposes.

One word in regard to the by-products of the Conference. There are delegates present representing every form of charitable work among us. Hospitals, orphan asylums, relief societies, settlements, sewing societies have sent their representatives to confer at our meetings. It has not been feasible to put upon the program all the questions they wish to discuss, and letters have been received requesting that such and such a topic be added to our list. A selection had to be made, and some regret will no doubt be felt at the omission of a particular subject. The situation can be met, however, by informal gatherings among the delegates representing the different kinds of associations. Our Conference has been made compact in order to cover our ground as quickly as may be, making it possible for delegates who come only for a three-day stay to have one day clear for specializing, so to speak, in their own line. Friday may profitably be devoted to roundtable discussions, arranged during the Conference, and the results of these discus-



sions, with the consequent clarifying of ideas, may figure in a future program. The value of such discussions should not be underrated, and the Executive Committee has decided that if biennial sessions of the Conference be continued as heretofore, in the years between the formal conferences, informal meetings should be held during the meetings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, at which those of us who attend that conference may come together, much in the way I have suggested for the delegates who desire to have section meetings follow this conference. It was at such a meeting that the Section of Social Workers was born, destined, I believe, to be an important addition to our Conference, and a valuable stimulus to the professional worker.

Whether we are ready for annual sessions of our Conference is another of those questions of methods which we shall have to face shortly. If the functions of the Conference are expanded, more frequent meetings than we hold now will be necessary. If we are to go on in the same way as heretofore, we may be satisfied with biennial meetings. But the annual meeting, I apprehend, is bound to come, for the cause of organized charity has never been in stronger favor than now, our questions are receiving intensive study, and the desire for a view of the experience of all communities is becoming imperative. Only at a conference of workers and delegates can we get fruitful interchange of opinion, and two years will be found to be too long to wait between meetings. The informal meetings in the year between conferences above referred to may be a good test for ascertaining the need of annual meetings, and even if we do nothing further under this head at this meeting the matter will not lapse.

So far we have considered only the organization, but the individual is at the ultimate foundation of all our movements. We cannot deal profitably with delegates alone. Directors and plain, ordinary citizens should follow and understand the development of our charities, and if in the past the papers and discussions we have here had been widely distributed and read we could have counted not only on more ample support, but also on keener and more widespread interest. To reach the individual I suggest that

an individual membership in this Conference be permitted, the dues to be fixed at a popular price, each member to receive a copy of our publications. This will not affect the balance between societies established by our constitution, for individuals need not have a vote in our meetings. But their adhesion to our Conference, and the receipt of our reports will, on the one side, strengthen our hands, and, on the other, disseminate the best Jewish thought on charitable, philanthropic and social questions.

The suggestions, growing out of my two years' experience as the Secretary of the National Conference of Jewish Charities, are advanced tentatively, and more as food for thought than as the necessary program of progress. Those two years have convinced me that our Conference performs a vital function in promoting charitable co-operation in this country, and it is bound to make for better, broader and sounder views on the questions which we all have so much at heart.

PRESIDENT HOLLANDER: This, the first and opening session of the Conference, will conclude with prayer.

#### PRAYER.

RABBI LEON HARRISON, St. Louis: Thou great Soul of all, we pray Thee not for substance, but for a double portion of Thy spirit. We do not ask Thee to do for any man that which his own right arm should do for himself. We would not willingly be unworthily dependent even upon Thee.

Teach us, then, the bitterness of dependence upon our fellow-man; of eating our bread out of the hand of another.

And wilt Thou not turn Thy face unto those that are crushed, not only by adverse forces, but by human hate; those in whose name and help we, their brothers in blood and in faith, are assembled?

We beseech Thee to transform this Brotherhood of a common Tragedy into the Brotherhood of a common Task. We ask Thee to change our sorrow into sympathy, and our pain into pity, that out of the black slime of human passions may grow the pure white lily of charity and love divine.

Oh Thou bounteous Spirit of all Good, Thou art, of all Thy gifts, Thyself the crown. Give what Thou eanst; without Thee we are poor, and with Thee rich; take what Thou wilt away. Amen!

Wednesday, May 18, 1910.

### MORNING SESSION.

PRESIDENT HOLLANDER: The Conferenee will be in order. The program which has been arranged for this morning's session, carrying out the general plan of this Conference, is to devote the entire morning to the consideration of one subject.

The subject is one that is absorbing, and has absorbed the attention of Jewish workers throughout the country, and presents one of the most difficult questions we have to deal with.

Mr. Morris D. Waldman, of New York, has prepared a careful paper, which he will present. This paper has been submitted to three members of the Conferenee, who will diseuss it in the light of the preliminary study which they have made of the paper. Thereafter the paper will be open for general discussion.

The following paper on the subject of desertion was then read by the Reporter, Mr. Morris D. Waldman, of New York:

### FAMILY DESERTION

BY MORRIS D. WALDMAN,

Manager of the United Hebrew Charities, New York.

### EXTENT.

As the National Conference of Jewish Charities, I take it, has for its purpose the consideration of Jewish social questions, this report must begin with an apology, for family desertion is by no means a distinctly Jewish problem. On the contrary, family desertion appears to be as prevalent among non-Jews, if not more so, judging by the reports issuing from non-Jewish eharities in this country. Whereas, of the eases treated by the United Hebrew Charities of New York during the two years ending September 30th, 1908, 11.66 per cent. were eases of desertion, of 5,000 indiserimi-



nately selected cases of the Charity Organization Society of that city, upon which Dr. Edward T. Devine's book "Causes of Misery" is based, 12.12 per cent. were such cases. In Buffalo, according to a statement made by Mr. Frederic Almy, Secretary of the Associated Charities, desertion cases formed during the past four years from 10 per cent. to 14 per cent. of the total. In that city desertion among Jews is hardly known. In St. Louis the Secretary of the Associated Charities could not furnish my correspondent with the exact figures, but stated that he suspected the desertion cases formed about 25 per cent. of the total number. In Detroit 15 per cent. of the non-Jewish cases last year were desertion cases. A more accurate basis of comparison would be the proportion of dependent desertion cases to population in Jewish and non-Jewish cases in the same city during the same period. When it is further considered that desertion among Jews is directly due, to some extent, to the unstable conditions among which they have for centuries lived, extenuation may be reasonably offered. That it is not a new problem the following extract from Abraham's "Jewish Life in the Middle Ages" will show :

"Wife desertion was an evil which was harder to deal with, for, owing to the unsettlement of Jewish life under continuous persecutions, the husband was frequently bound to leave home in search of a livelihood, and perhaps to contract his services for long periods to foreign employers. The husband endeavored to make ample provision for his wife's maintenance during his absence, or, if he failed to do so, the wife was supported at the public cost and the husband compelled to refund the sums so expended. These absences grew to such abnormal lengths that in the twelfth century it became necessary to protect the wife by limiting the absence to eighteen months—an interval which was only permitted to husbands who had obtained the formal sanction of the communal authorities. On his return the husband was compelled to remain at least six months with his family before again starting on his involuntary travels. During the first year of marriage it became a well-established rule of conduct that the husband was not to leave home on any considerable journey." A treatise called "Kontres Hoagunah," published in

Salonica in 1651, deals exclusively with the problem of family desertion. Section 17 of the Shulchan Aruch, the Jewish Code, treats entirely of this problem. Even here Koheleth's reputation for wisdom is vindicated—there is nothing new under the sun. In the Jewish Encyclopedia Dr. Kaufman Kohler's treatment of the Jewish law of desertion is further proof that we are not dealing with a new problem. The fact that there is a Hebrew word for a deserted woman, "Agunah," shows that she was not unknown when Hebrew was the vernacular.

It is not the purpose of this report to deal with the entire question of family desertion. Our legitimate interest is confined to only that small proportion of desertion cases in which the desertion has driven the wife to apply for aid at a relief agency. But even as a charity problem it is a serious one in most of the larger cities of the country. In St. Louis 78, or 7 per cent. of the total number of applicants last year, were deserted women; in Baltimore 90, or 16 per cent.; in Chicago 204, or 11 per cent.; in New York 1046, or 10 per cent. In Chicago over \$11,600 was spent by the Jewish Charities on desertion cases last year; in Baltimore, \$3,000; in San Francisco, \$2,650; in New York, \$37,000. This does not include the cost of maintaining children of deserted wives in the orphanages, hospitals and other institutions. The number of such children in the Jewish child-caring institutions of New York probably exceeds 600, costing for their maintenance annually \$70,000. The exact number could not be furnished by all the institutions. The United Hebrew Charities of New York had on its records last year 1046 deserted women as against 1655 widows. That is, to every three widows the organization entertained applications from two deserted women.

The problem of desertion is probably the most vexing and perplexing with which relief agencies are called upon to deal and, though from time to time experiences at these conferences have been interchanged, a solution has not yet been discovered which can be applied generally. Mr. Jacob Billikopf, of Kansas City, writes that his society had to deal with only one case of abandonment last year, and further says that the reason they have so few deserters is because he has gained an unenviable reputation

as a prosecutor. Mr. Billikopf is evidently fortunate in being a member of the Board of Parole and Pardons in his city, invested to some extent with magistrate's power. Possibly it would be wise for the superintendents of the charities of smaller cities to have themselves appointed magistrates, but those of us unfortunately who are at the head of charities in the larger cities have so much to do with the management of their own organizations that they must forego such opportunities to serve the general community. Dr. Bogen, of Cincinnati, has apparently also arrived at a solution, and that without being a magistrate. His plan is just the other way; instead of sitting in judgment upon all such delinquents, he refuses to sit in judgment upon any and turns them all over to the Ohio Humane Society. Dr. Bogen wrote me last year that he had only 12 cases of desertion—eight new and four from previous years. When I wrote asking how many desertion cases Cincinnati had the year before this plan was introduced he replied that it would be difficult to trace, but stated that the first year the plan was inaugurated they had 23 new cases and 7 old ones—30 in all—or two and one-half times as many as during 1909. He is sure, however, that they had many more than at present.

I presume the term "scientific charity" is taboo at this conference, a counter reformation in Jewish Charities having apparently set in. The pendulum which ten years ago swung from the heart to the brain in charity work seems now on its return swing. However we may feel on the subject of "scientific charity," it must be conceded that probing into the causes of our social problems is altogether necessary before we can begin to formulate plans for their elimination. It was with this conviction that in 1902 the United Hebrew Charities of New York undertook an investigation of the causes of desertion among 250 cases, and it is something in the nature of a coincidence that I was the investigator. I had never before been connected with a charity organization, had not been specially interested in the problem of wife and child abandonment, and so brought to the work a *tabula rasa*, so to speak, without preconceived notions that could be prejudicial to the investigation. The results of that investigation stimulated the society to greater energy in the direction

of making the law of desertion in New York severer in punishment than it was at the time. The study was quite intensive in character and the method pursued could only be very crudely applied at this time to an investigation in other cities, especially as the present investigation had to be made within a very limited time by different persons, with differing forms of record.

I wrote to the following cities for information: Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Detroit, Cleveland, Cincinnati, Louisville, St. Louis, Chicago, Kansas City and San Francisco. Louisville, Cleveland and Boston have not replied. Louisville states my letter did not reach. Detroit and Philadelphia could only give information concerning their new cases; the former city had only six cases in all and therefore its experience was quite useless for our purpose. In some important details none of the cities could give the required information; not one could furnish comparative figures of desertion cases and total number of cases for any considerable length of time, making it impossible to judge accurately of the increase or decrease of such cases. I fear that my persistent questioning severely taxed the patience of some of the superintendents of the societies. One superintendent was too busy to compile the necessary figures, but extended a cordial invitation to me to send someone there for them, a thousand miles away. My experiences suggest that the only way in which to secure reliable information upon this subject is to induce the various organizations to carry on uniform statistics. I have prepared forms which, if approved, should be distributed among the organizations not later than September 1st, before the beginning of their fiscal year; these forms should guide the study of the subject the whole of the year. The returns then could be compiled by a committee appointed for that purpose, and published by the Conference before its next convention.

It is only fair to say that the responses to my inquiries were in general very cordial and our thanks are due to all the organizations which replied, for their prompt and willing co-operation.

#### CAUSES OF DESERTION.

The answer to the question, "Why do men desert their families?" would not only be interesting because it would satisfy

a natural curiosity, but also because it would point the way to a solution of the problem. Miss Zilpha D. Smith, who made a study of deserted cases in Boston in 1901, said: "To answer this satisfactorily one would have to make a psychological study of the mind of each deserting husband, a most difficult task, since it was difficult even to make his acquaintance." Only a very small percentage of returning husbands apply for relief after their return, and so it is only rarely that we have been able to get at the reasons for desertion from the lips of the delinquents themselves. In the hope that I might secure some valuable information of this kind, I asked the investigators of my staff to visit as many as possible of the new desertion cases of last year who have not applied for relief this year, and to ascertain, among other facts, the cause of desertion in each case. In all 105 cases were visited; of these 69 could not be located, having moved from the former address; in a very small number of them neighbors and relatives volunteered some information which usually, however, was too vague to be reliable. Of the remainder, in 13 cases the husband had not returned nor was his whereabouts known; in 5 reunion between husband and wife had been effected in a city outside of New York; in 6 the husband had been located, but had not returned; in only 12 cases was it found that the husbands returned and were interviewed by the visitor. Of the 17 who had been reunited either in New York or elsewhere 10 had left because of lack of work or insufficient earnings; 2 because of incompatibility of temper; 1 because of interference of the mother-in-law (strangely enough both the husband and wife in this case were deaf mutes); 4 had left for reasons unknown. The causes given originally for the desertion differed, as far as could be learned, in four cases from the cause ascertained after the husband was interviewed. In two cases the cause given was lack of work and was eventually found to be incompatibility of temper; search for work was not the primary cause in either case. In the other two cases, where the cause at first was unknown, the return of the husband showed in one other women and in the other, incompatibility of temper.

It will be of interest here to remark that in the investigation made in 1902 of five cases where the wife had alleged the cause



for her husband's departure to be another woman, in three the return of the husband proved the desertion to be due to a less reprehensible cause—namely, incompatibility of temper.

It is safe to say that the cause of family abandonment is in every case not simple, but complex. It is impossible to determine all the incidences and factors which drive a man to leave his family to the tender mercy of circumstances. It is only possible after even the most searching investigation and analysis to arrive at the chief cause and this, as the above experience and for that matter the experience of us all shows, is often doubtful. After my investigation of 1902 was made I tabulated rather crudely the chief causes in the following way:

Other women.....	65
Licentiousness .....	10
Dissipation .....	10
Gambling .....	7
Drink .....	6
Woman's immorality.....	3
Laziness .....	16
Marriage for money solely.....	3
Incompatibility of temper.....	19
Interference of relatives.....	12
Roving disposition.....	3
To seek health.....	9
Man's insanity.....	4
Woman's insanity.....	1
Woman's sickness.....	1
Money fever.....	1
To seek work.....	62
Unknown .....	12

Though these figures in their very nature cannot be absolute, a similar tabulation made in a recent investigation of 86 cases carried on from January 1st to March 15th of this year, would indicate the general correctness of my early observations. Where immorality of the husband appeared to be the cause in 1902 in 30 per cent. of the cases, it was 22 per cent. in the recent investigation; where lack of work was 25 per cent. in 1902 it was

25 per cent. in 1910; where incompatibility was 17 per cent. in 1902 it was 20 per cent. in 1910. In all the other cases about the same percentage prevails.

This recent investigation was made by Mr. Monroe M. Goldstein, a young attorney, who had never before been interested in the subject, and who was wholly unaware of the 1902 investigation.

The main causes of desertion can be divided into two classes—subjective and objective. In the first class are those cases in which the self-indulgence of either spouse is to blame; in the second are those where the cause springs from conditions over which neither has control. Roughly speaking, the first class includes those cases where immorality or other bad habits are the cause; in the second, where industrial conditions or illness is the cause. A mere glance at the table above mentioned shows that in the majority of cases the self-indulgence of the spouse, usually the husband, is the chief cause.

Miss Smith, of Boston, reported that as far as she was able to determine 11 per cent. of the 234 deserted families she had investigated, among the applicants at the Associated Charities of Boston, were due to immorality, whereas over 30 per cent. of the United Hebrew Charities cases investigated in 1902 were due to this cause. In the recent United Hebrew Charities investigation, of 86 cases 22 per cent. were due to this cause; this would seem to indicate a rather shockingly high proportion of immorality among the Jewish cases in New York and higher also than in the Jewish cases in other cities. In San Francisco it was 20 per cent.; in Philadelphia, 21 per cent.; in Baltimore, 11 per cent.; in Chicago, 15 per cent.; in St. Louis, 8 per cent.; in Cincinnati, 8 per cent.; in Detroit 2 of the 6 new cases were due to this cause, but the cases being so few the proportion is not indicative of the general situation. However, in the report of Miss Lillian Brandt, made among non-Jewish cases in 25 cities, of 386 cases where the cause was available in 110 cases, or 28 per cent., was the cause due to what she terms "sexual irregularity." In 53 the men had left with another woman; in 22 they had left for other women, showing licentiousness; in 17 the women were blamed to be lax in their morals; in 15

both were lax; in 9 the man had married to make the child legitimate. In this connection it is interesting to note that in only three of the 250 Jewish cases investigated in 1902 were the women known to be guilty of sexual irregularity. The investigation made by Miss Brandt shows that immorality is the cause more frequently among non-Jews than among Jews; nevertheless, the large proportion of such cases among Jews is alarming in the light of our pride in the decency and purity of Jewish family life. There is undoubtedly a peculiar reason for this disagreeable situation. The 1902 investigation was made in two sections; the second section comprised 128 cases; of these 33 were due to other women; of these 33, careful inquiry disclosed the fact that in 22, or 67 per cent., the husband had arrived in this country at least six months before his family. In the majority of the cases he had arrived one year or more prior to his families; of the 19 cases investigated by Mr. Goldstein, in which the husband had ostensibly deserted because of other women, 11 had arrived before the wife. This fact undoubtedly presents some extenuation for the surprisingly high percentage due to immorality, for it is among the Jews principally that the husband leaves his family in Europe to come to America unhandicapped in his effort to establish a firm footing. It is not so surprising for men thus situated to enter into relations with young women. When it is considered also that marriage among these people in the old countries is very frequently made through the instrumentality of *shadchanim*, or marriage agents, rather than through the natural channel of love and affection, the offense, though reprehensible, appears less surprising. It cannot be doubted that in many of these cases, had their families arrived with them, the men would not have yielded to a stranger's charms.

It has been commonly supposed that lack of work is the main general cause of family abandonment among the poor; our investigation shows that this is not so. In St. Louis 28 per cent. were due to this cause; in Chicago, 25 per cent.; in Baltimore, 18 per cent.; in San Francisco, 14 per cent.; in New York, among the United Hebrew Charities cases both in 1902 and 1910, 25 per cent. It is also the general impression that a condition of



unemployment stimulates an increase in desertion. Baltimore writes in reply to my inquiry, "Was there an increase or a decrease over previous years in desertion cases from November, 1907, to January, 1909 (during the hard times)?" as follows: "The Federated (non-Jewish) Charities could not furnish the desired information; the Catholic institutions state that there was neither an increase nor a decrease during the hard times. In the number of Jewish desertions there was an increase of about 10 per cent. during the time of the crisis and a decrease of the same percentage since January, 1909." In reply to my question, "If either, increase or decrease, how do you account for it?" the answer from Baltimore was: "The increase in the number of desertions during the hard times can be readily explained by the fact that during that time work was very scarce and a number of men left the city in search of employment, in the meantime leaving their families to be assisted by the charitable institutions." Chicago writes that there was an increase, due to lack of employment. Frederic Almy, of Buffalo, in a letter to the Hon. Frank Wade, of the same city, written in November, 1909, speaks of the decrease of desertion as follows: "This seems to me very gratifying, especially when we remember that we have had two years of hard times, when desertion would naturally have been more frequent." I fear that this belief is not founded upon facts. In New York the situation seems different; hard times and consequent unemployment seem to have very little relation to desertion, as the following figures will show: Between October, 1908, and April, 1909, when the United Hebrew Charities was subjected to the heaviest demands in the history of the society, and when those who applied because of lack of work reached unprecedentedly high figures, the number of desertions was hardly greater than during the same period of the present year, when industrial conditions were normal. In October, 1908, when the total number of new cases reached 451 and 138 were due to lack of work, 44 were due to desertion. In November there were 409 new cases, of which 155 were due to lack of work and 35 were due to desertion. In December the figures were total 488, 198 due to lack of work and 29 to desertion. In January 637 was the total number of new cases—243 because of lack of work

and 37 due to desertion. In February the figures were 456, 167 and 35, respectively. In March 418, 114 and 30. During the present fiscal year, when the total number of new cases in October was 212, lack of work was the cause in 30 and desertion in 33; in November the figures were 287, 29 and 29, respectively. In December 384, 99 and 33, respectively. In January 359, 89 and 32, respectively. In February 339, 300 and 15, respectively. In other words, for the first six months of the last fiscal year, when unemployment was general and the new lack of work cases numbered 901, the total number of desertion cases during this period was 180, whereas during the same period of the present fiscal year, with industrial conditions normal, the number of lack of work cases was 300, or less than one-third of the whole number of lack of work cases during the hard times, and yet the desertion cases numbered 150, only 30 less than the whole number of the desertion cases during the hard times. Or, basing the analysis upon the total number of new cases, we find that during the hard times of the 2,441 new cases desertion cases formed a total of 7.4 per cent.; whereas during the good times they number, out of 1,600 new cases, 10.4 per cent. That is, though there were actually fewer desertion cases during the good times, they were entirely out of proportion to the tremendous decrease in unemployment cases. The experience of the Jewish Charities in Philadelphia shows a reduction in desertion cases during hard times; Max Herzberg writes as follows: "We find that there is less desertion when work is slack and business conditions bad than in other years; men rarely desert their families in order to better their condition; the hard-working man out of employment is not likely to run away and leave his family dependent upon charity; the deserter is usually immoral or shiftless, and in bad times he is not apt to have the money to gratify his wandering proclivities." Another reason advanced for this, which appears plausible, may be that during the hard times the hard-working man realizes that it is useless for him to go elsewhere in this country, because the chances of his getting work elsewhere are just as slim as they are in his home city. My own impression is also that during the hard times relief agencies permit unemployment to be a legitimate ground for the granting of relief;

in other words, it is not necessary for a man to desert his family during such times in order to insure aid for them on the part of the charities.

It will be more accurate probably to attribute the cause of the 25 per cent. of desertion cases in New York to insufficient earnings rather than to lack of work. Of the 21 cases where lack of employment is given as the cause of the 86 recently investigated cases, the average weekly earnings of the man while employed were approximately \$9.30 and the number of persons in the family averaged 4. Of these, 12 were engaged in the needle trade, 6 were peddlers, 1 was a shoemaker, 1 a tinsmith and 1 an expressman's helper.

It has been our common experience that the birth of a child or the expected birth of a child is a frequent incident in a desertion; this is particularly true in cases of lack of work or insufficient earnings. In the 1902 investigation out of 33 cases of the second section in which the cause was lack of work, this was the case in 14, or about 40 per cent.; 8 occurred before the wife's accouchement and 6 after.

The next most frequent causes for desertion are incompatibility of temper and interference of relatives, the latter very often involved in the former. Though the husband is partly to blame in these cases, the incompetence and ignorance of the wife and indiscretion of relatives are largely at fault; economic conditions is also frequently a subsidiary cause. The following extract from my report of 1902 is as true today as it was then. "One need but visit a few families to see that the word 'home' is but a mockery for the dirty, ill-smelling rooms in which many of our applicants are forced to live. When we remember the typical housewife must wash, iron and scrub, must prepare her children for school, must usually nurse a baby and in addition must cook for the family, we cannot expect her to provide an attractive home for her husband; in a great many cases the husband is employed in some shop or factory in the vicinity of Broadway (for most of them are engaged in the garment trade) and so is brought in contact with orderliness and cleanliness. In most cases it is cheaper for the man to have his noon-day meal in a neighboring restaurant, where for 25 cents, or 20 cents or even

15 cents, he can obtain a fairly well prepared meal—not a meal truly which would attract the fastidious, but in reality infinitely better cooked and better served than at home. The man becomes accustomed to his separate plate and his cloth napkin, unheard of luxuries at home; the aesthetic sense in him is developed; the meals at home are no longer appetizing; apart from the character and service of the food, the home environment becomes most unattractive; with the wash tub in the middle of the room, the clothes hanging up near the stove to dry, if it should happen to be a rainy day, the wife unkempt and fretful and the children noisy. All these things have their effect in alienating the man's interest from his family; coming in contact with the outer world, the husband rises to a higher standard of living and he finds the 'home' atmosphere decidedly uncomfortable. This is surely true in many cases, though of course it is impossible to tabulate figures which will show in just how many cases the husband's standard of living has risen above that of his wife." In cases where the husband arrived before his wife the likelihood of such alienation obviously is greater. Incompatibility of temper seems to be a frequent reason for desertion in other cities of the country. In St. Louis 35 per cent. of the cases are attributed to this cause; Chicago, 15 per cent.; Baltimore, 22 per cent.; San Francisco, 28 per cent.; Philadelphia, 30 per cent.; Cincinnati only 8 per cent., but only 12 cases were entertained by the charities of that city and the figures are not, therefore, indicative.

Disparity in the ages of husband and wife is undoubtedly often conducive to a discontent which results in family abandonment. In over 10 per cent. of the cases investigated in 1902, the wife confessed herself older than her husband; the percentage is probably much higher. It would naturally be expected that the greatest number of those whose motives for abandonment is immorality would show a disparity of age as a subsidiary cause. A table which I prepared showing the relation of main causes to other factors has unfortunately been lost, but I recall that it was in cases of immorality that disparity of age was most frequent. Of the 250 cases 85 husbands were between twenty and thirty years of age; 118 between thirty-five and forty; 40 between forty and fifty and only 2 were over fifty. Those who deserted for other

women were largely between thirty and forty; 50 per cent. of the husbands were between these ages, 25 per cent. between twenty and thirty and 25 per cent. above forty. In the cases investigated by Mr. Goldstein only one was discovered where there was a difference between the ages of the spouses. In this case the wife was thirty years old and the husband sixty. Upon inquiry as to why she married so old a man, she naively explained that she thought this was a sure way of keeping a husband. The poor thing was wrong.

It was pitiable to observe that in 50 out of the 62 cases in which the cause was lack of employment or insufficient earnings, the husbands were below the age of forty, at a time when they ought to have been best fitted to fight the battle of life. In some cases undoubtedly the men were industrially inefficient; in many of them, however, unfortunate industrial conditions were to blame.

In those families which were disrupted because of unpleasant and conflicting tempers investigation showed that about 60 per cent. of the husbands who deserted were above forty. This does not indicate necessarily that discontent arose after many years of wedlock, for among the 19 cases in which the man's desertion was due to incompatibility of temper 10 were repeated desertions, earlier desertions having taken place while the men were still quite young.

It is astonishing to learn that with a number of husbands who leave wife and children desertion has become practically a habit; among 219 cases 37 men deserted twice, 9 three times, 6 four times and 20 more than four times, a total of 72, or nearly 33 per cent. who deserted their families more than once. More remarkable is it still to observe that repeated desertions are comparatively rare in those cases, where the cause for desertion is to seek work (only 7 out of 49).

The investigation made by Mr. Goldstein shows that of the 21 cases in which lack of work was the cause, only 2 had deserted before. It may be stated generally that one desertion is usually enough for a man whose only cause for leaving his family is unemployment or insufficient earnings. Cases of repeated desertion are very frequent where the cause is immorality. The 1902 investigation showed 33 out of 64, over 50 per cent.



It must appear strange to learn that repeated desertions are common in those cases where the cause is immorality. It is no doubt shocking that women, once deserted for other women, and in a number of cases three to five times, are willing to receive their husbands back again. This is evidence of lack of proper self-respect on the one hand or abject poverty on the other. In a number of cases the deserted women emphatically declared that they would never again become reconciled to their husbands, but often the women stated that as they could not themselves support their children, they would be willing to receive their husbands back again were they to return. In one case the husband had remained away on and off for seven years, and had lived with another woman during these intervals and had had children by her, but had meanwhile supported his wife and legitimate children by weekly allowances. One year prior to the investigation he decided to return for good to his first wife; he lived with her for nearly a year and then left her, but never failed to give her \$6 a week. What is more astonishing in this case is the fact that when the husband returned for good to his wife he brought his illegitimate children to her and she willingly cared for them, though their mother was living.

The cause for desertion in this case was not originally the other woman, but incompatibility of temper. After he had deserted he fell in with the woman, had two children by her, to whom he was as much attached as to his legitimate offspring. The parental love which induced him to give his wife a weekly allowance prompted him to take his illegitimate offspring from the custody of his paramour, who was unfit to care for them, and give them in charge of his wife, whom he disliked but respected. The wife, on the other hand, was moved by feelings of pity for her husband's illegitimate children and so was willing to receive them in charge. There were redeeming qualities both in the husband and the wife.

It is in those cases where the cause for desertion was incompatibility of temper that we expect to find the greatest proportion of repeated desertions, and investigation bears out our expectations. Ten out of nineteen were cases of repeated desertion. The study of repeated desertions is especially valuable in directing

the manner and method of the treatment of the family; such a study is indispensable in each individual case, for upon it must the visitor largely base her recommendation of relief.

Another correlative factor that must enter into the wise treatment of a deserted family is the study of the length of time the husband has remained away during his desertion. It may be stated as a general rule that the interval of desertion in cases of oft repeated abandonment is nearly arithmetical in its progression. In 18 cases in which the husbands returned after a search for work not one had remained away longer than six months. Indeed, 13 were away less than one month. In cases where other women was the cause, the greater number, oddly enough, remained away either between two and six months or between one and two years; 11 in the former and 7 in the latter, and only 2 between seven and twelve months inclusive. All told, the greatest number of so-called chronic deserters stayed away no longer than six months; more than half of the whole number of returned husbands show the return before six months. In only one case did the husband remain away longer than two years, and the cause of his desertion was other women. In the 17 cases which applied for the first time at the United Hebrew Charities of New York in 1909, but who did not repeat their application during the present fiscal year, in which the husband had been found at home again, none had remained away longer than eleven months; 7 remained away less than six months. The 1902 investigation showed that the greatest proportion of those who returned were those in which the cause was gambling; 7 had deserted for this reason and 3 of them had returned. The next highest proportion of returned husbands was among those whose cause was sickness and search for a better climate, numbering 3 out of 9. Out of the 62 cases in which search for work was the cause, 18 returned, and not one of these 18 had remained away longer than six months. Of all the returned husbands, numbering 36, 7 had deserted more than once; in three of them the latest desertion was the second one, and in the other four, more than the fourth. In the other cities of the country the proportion of desertion repeaters varies somewhat. In St. Louis 85% of the desertions were the first, 10% were

the second, 5% the third or more. In Chicago, 62% deserted once, 10% twice and 8% three times or more. In Baltimore 55% were the first offenders, 22% second and 22% three or more. In Philadelphia, the percentages are 86, 9 and 5, respectively.

Among the factors which are responsible for family abandonment and yet which cannot be said to be the chief or immediate cause, there are several which stand out prominently, such as the health of the wife, repeated marriage, and vicious companionship. To illustrate, in the 1902 investigation, it was found that the wife suffered from some chronic ailment or physical debility; in 46 cases or about 19%. A considerable proportion of those were probably unable to continue marital relations. In Cincinnati, the report states that 33% were in this condition; in San Francisco 7% and in Philadelphia 5%.

As far as repeated marriages are concerned, it is of interest to know that in the cases of 1902, where the cause was unknown, numbering 12, in five of them the deserter was the second husband; of those cases where the main cause was interference of relations, numbering 12, in four of them were the deserters the second husband.

Nearly as interesting as the question, "Why do men desert?" is the question, "Why do men return?" Of the 250 cases in 1902, 37 returned; of these 18 had left because of lack of work or insufficient earnings; 14 of them returned because the prospects of steady work or higher wages were no better elsewhere than in New York; in three they had returned because of the birth of a child; one returned after having heard of the sudden death of his wife. Of those who had left because of incompatibility of temper, only four returned; in one the cause of his return was fear of prosecution, in the other three ill health was the cause. Of those whom gambling had seduced, three returned in remorse. Of the 65 cases in which immorality was thought to have been the cause, five returned. In two the real cause was found to be incompatibility of temper, leaving three husbands where the cause had been correctly surmised at first.

Of the cases investigated by Mr. Goldstein, six returned of their own accord. In five the cause originally given was lack of



work; in four of these the return of the husband showed the cause to have been correctly given. In the sixth case the real cause was correctly given—laziness. In the seven cases where the return of the husband was secured through the efforts of the Charities, the true cause had not been given in two cases. In one where lack of work had been stated as the cause, the return of the husband showed the man's sickness to have been the real cause. In one where bad habits was the alleged reason, it proved to be incompatibility. In the seven cases where the man had been arrested, or interviewed and threatened with arrest, the real cause was found to have been given correctly. In thirteen cases where action is pending and the whereabouts of the husband is known in only one case as far as could be ascertained, was the given cause not the true one. In this case the alleged cause was incompatibility; the real cause is another woman.

#### REMEDIES.

Many who have been dealing with desertion have sometimes felt that the evil might be checked to some extent if the relief agency were to refuse to entertain desertion cases. The experience of Cincinnati would indicate that such a plan would be effective, though Dr. Bogen was unable to tell accurately just how effective it has been in his city. When asked for suggestions as to reducing the evil, he tersely replied, "Don't handle it as a charity proposition." The Cincinnati plan is a drastic method which under any circumstances could be applied only where a clear and sympathetic understanding exists with a public agency like the Ohio Humane Society. It is probable, however, that such a method would only discourage those from deserting who really care for their families. It may be assumed that it would check those who desert because of lack of work, roving disposition, to seek health and gambling, which form about one-third the number of cases. It would discourage some also undoubtedly, who leave for more reprehensible reasons. Roughly speaking, such a method might reduce the number of desertions to about one-half. But the expense to the organization would by no means thereby be reduced by one-half. For those who have the interest of their families at heart sufficiently to return if they found

them denied relief, do return nevertheless of their own accord within a short time. And their families are only a temporary burden to the Charities. Only a small percentage of deserted families remain a permanent burden. Of the 403 new desertion cases on the records of the United Hebrew Charities of New York in the fiscal year 1908-1909, only 54 or 13% have applied for relief this year. As stated before, of 105 cases visited recently, forming a considerable number of last year's new desertion cases which had not applied this year, in only 19 had we knowledge of the failure of the husband to return; in 69 the families could not be located, and even if it cannot be assumed that they all returned, it is probable that the great majority returned; at any rate they did not apply again for relief. It is true that the United Hebrew Charities of New York has, at the present time, 652 cases of desertion where the first application for relief was made more than one year ago, but these are cases largely where all hope of the husband's return is lost, and probably where even the rigid policy of refusing relief would not induce them to return. Many of them may no longer be living, for who knows how many of these deserted women are in reality widows, their husbands having met with sudden or violent deaths, unknown to them. The United Hebrew Charities of New York has 80 desertion cases on its pension lists, who draw in round figures \$1,000 per month in relief. Of the 652 cases of desertion above mentioned, in 62 though the cause of distress this year is desertion, the wives applied for relief in previous years for other causes.

Of these 9 applied for a different cause over 10 years ago.

"	"	3	"	"	"	"	"	9	"	"
"	"	6	"	"	"	"	"	8	"	"
"	"	1	"	"	"	"	"	7	"	"
"	"	2	"	"	"	"	"	6	"	"
"	"	4	"	"	"	"	"	5	"	"
"	"	2	"	"	"	"	"	4	"	"
"	"	2	"	"	"	"	"	3	"	"
"	"	15	"	"	"	"	"	2	"	"
"	"	18	"	"	"	"	"	1 year	"	"

Of the remaining 590 desertion cases whose original application over a year ago was due to desertion,

130	or 22.0%	applied	over	10	years	ago.
26	4.4%	"	"	9	"	"
21	3.5%	"	"	8	"	"
32	5.4%	"	"	7	"	"
40	6.7%	"	"	6	"	"
47	7.9%	"	"	5	"	"
40	6.7%	"	"	4	"	"
61	10.3%	"	"	3	"	"
95	16.0%	"	"	2	"	"
98	16.6%	"	"	1	year	"

Judging by our experience in 1902, where only one of the returning husbands had been away longer than two years, we can reasonably assume that a man who remains away from his family over two years will not be brought back by the failure of a relief organization to support his family. Therefore, if the Cincinnati method were to be applied in New York, it may be assumed that 68% would not return. Moreover, of the 32% who had been away less than three years, 68%, or 131, judging by previous experience, are bound to remain away longer than three years, leaving only 62 cases in which the husband might be expected to return. So it would appear that the Cincinnati method would discourage only the temporary deserter, who cost the United Hebrew Charities of New York last year only \$1,750 (leaving \$35,000 as a necessary relief expenditure for the others), and 10% of the permanent desertion cases which cost the organization \$3,500. The total saving therefore by applying the Cincinnati method to New York, if successful would be according to this analysis, only about \$5,000, or 1/7 of the total cost. It is not our desire to prevent only those men from deserting who rely upon the Charities to assume their legal and moral family responsibilities. We want to reach that much larger number who desert regardless as to whether the Charities care for their families or not, and for this purpose we must look to other means.

In the very comprehensive report of the Committee on Desertion presented to the National Conference of Jewish Charities in

1900, are given suggestions to prevent or reduce the evil of desertion. Briefly summed up, they are:

First—Elevation of the general tone of our co-religionists.

Second—The co-operation of the various Jewish societies in ferreting out the deserter, and the proper steps towards his arrest and rendition to his residence for punishment.

Third—Charity societies should strive to influence legislation in different states to make abandonment a criminal offense, and to insure the rendition of fugitive husbands.

Elevation of the general tone of a community is a slow process. There is one method that is promising of quicker results, and that lies in the strong hand of the law. At the time this report was submitted, the law in most States was not very helpful. In New York abandonment of wife and children was not a crime; it was only disorderly conduct and the culprit was ordered to pay a specified sum weekly for the support of his family. He was placed under bonds to pay this money for one year. If he could not procure surety, the City Magistrate would convict him as a disorderly person and sentence him to imprisonment for not longer than six months. As an instance of our powerlessness at that time, in the face of this serious evil, I cite the following case:

The United Hebrew Charities received a communication from the London Board of Guardians to the effect that among their charges was a woman with three children, who had come from Russia en route to the United States, in order to find her husband who is in New York, address unknown, and asking the United Hebrew Charities to look the man up and let them know whether it was advisable to have them send the wife on to New York. After considerable difficulty, I discovered the man's whereabouts, found him living with another woman, and learned the following as the result of a thorough investigation. That the man had given his wife a "ghet" in Russia more than ten years ago, but owing to his love for the children, he became reconciled to her several years later. After a time, however, she again made life unbearable for him and he left for New York, but sent remittances to her at irregular intervals. In New York he fell in with an attractive widow, with whom he had been

living for more than four years, and for whom he entertained real affection. He was willing to become custodian of the children. An aunt of the deserted woman, living in New York, asked the United Hebrew Charities to recommend her niece's transportation hither, claiming that the husband would live with the wife once she arrived. The husband, on the other hand, stated positively he would not live with her and that if she came, he would leave the city. He was, however, willing to send weekly remittances through the United Hebrew Charities of \$5 per week, on condition that she remained in Europe. This case brings out practically all the difficulties bearing on desertion at that time. If this man ceased sending remittances, he could have done so with impunity, because under the law as it was then, nobody but a wife could be a competent witness against him. If his wife had been sent here and he had become aware of it, he could have gone across the river to Jersey City, out of New York's jurisdiction. Being a painter, he could easily have found work in any city and it would have been a comparatively easy matter for him to go from one State to another. No matter how close and warm the co-operation between charity societies, it would practically be impossible to discover his whereabouts. If, on the other hand, we would have had his wife come over without his knowledge, have helped her to obtain a warrant for his arrest, have had him arrested and brought before the Magistrate, the latter at best would have ordered him to pay a specified sum per week and would have placed him under bonds. If he could not obtain a bondsman, he would have gone to jail for six months and his family would be dependent on the United Hebrew Charities, because in the Workhouse the man is made to work but neither he nor his family obtain anything for his labor. If he should have been so fortunate as to obtain a bondsman, the Court would have ordered him to pay probably \$3.00, \$1.00 per child, (the man claiming to earn but \$12 per week in busy season)—\$2.00 less than what the United Hebrew Charities succeeded in forcing from him, and then after a year, he would have left the city. As it was, he sent sufficient for the support of his family in London through the Charities of New York, but at the same time the Society was forced to act as party to the illegitimate relation between the man and the woman with whom he then lived.



This typical case shows all the obstacles existing at that time in the way of overcoming the evil of desertion by legal means. And these obstacles exist today in every State where desertion is not an extraditable offense. Fortunately for the relief organizations in New York, largely through efforts of Dr. Frankel, child abandonment was made an extraditable offense in 1905, and so today in such cases, the offender cannot escape punishment by leaving the State, nor is it necessary for the wife to be a witness against him. Of the 19 cases in which the deserter returned between January 1st and March 15th of this year, 8 were brought back by the threat that the felony law would be invoked, 5 were arrested, of whom 3 were extradited through the Desertion Bureau of the Educational Alliance, which furnishes legal assistance to the Charities in these cases. Of these 1 was extradited from Chicago and is awaiting trial, and the other 2 have been convicted, one under suspended sentence to pay \$10 a month to his wife and child and one serving a sentence of two years' imprisonment and fined \$1,000.

Since the law went into effect the latter end of 1905, the District Attorney of New York entertained up to January 1st, 1910, altogether 128 cases of child abandonment. Of these, indictments were secured in 93 cases and convictions in 72; up to the middle of last year the District Attorney's office displayed but meagre activity in the direction of prosecuting deserters under the felony law. It is difficult to estimate the effect of this law upon the Charities. From the following figures of the United Hebrew Charities, it will be observed that the actual number of desertion cases has not varied much during the last seven years, even in terms of total number of cases:

Desertion			
Year.	Cases.	Per Cent.	Total.
1903	1052	9.5	10,924
1904	970	9.3	10,334
1905	1124	11.2	10,015
1906	1040	12.2	8,643
1907	1006	11.0	8,970
1908	1049	9.7	10,776
1909	1046	10.1	10,296



But when it is remembered that the population of the city has increased considerably, it appears that desertion has relatively decreased. In 1902 the Jewish population of New York was estimated to be about 500,000. Today, the population probably exceeds 800,000. In 1902 the number of dependent desertion cases being 1,052, was .21% of the total Jewish population of the city. In 1909, being 1,046, it formed only .13% of the total population.

It is impossible to ascribe the relative decrease to any one cause. The establishment of a Desertion Bureau has probably been instrumental to some extent in checking the growth of the evil. The felony law may also have had some effect, even though it has not been energetically administered.

Of late, however, with a new district attorney in office, extraditions have been increasing and should this energetic policy be continued throughout his administration, we shall at its expiration, be better enabled to determine whether the felony law is having the desired effect as a deterrent. Detroit writes that child abandonment is a felony in Michigan and because of this law, desertion has been reduced. In Ohio, child abandonment is a felony also, yet the Cincinnati Charities attribute its decrease in desertion cases to its peculiar method of treatment. In St. Louis, it is a misdemeanor and Mr. Seman suggests as a remedy the enactment of the felony law. In Baltimore also it is a misdemeanor, and the Society says it can therefore secure only limited support from the courts. In San Francisco it is a felony, the law having been enacted by the last Legislature, but Mr. Levy, the Superintendent of the Relief Society in that city writes, "it is ineffective because the case must first come before the police judge, who invariably releases the offender on probation." He writes furthermore that police and superior judges look with disfavor upon the law making wife desertion a felony and it is only in an aggravated case that a police judge will permit a charge of felony to be entered. The man is usually prosecuted under a misdemeanor charge, and if at all punished, is in prison for a few days, never in his cases for over a week. In Philadelphia desertion is a misdemeanor, but is extraditable, punishable by imprisonment for a term of one year and also an order against the man for the support of the wife, giving the same advantages for prosecution that would be enjoyed if the law were a felony.

It has been maintained that a misdemeanor is an extraditable offense and that it would be far better if emphatic pressure were brought to bear upon State authorities to regard it as such, than to make the offense a felony. For if this would be done, the culprit could as readily be apprehended and brought to justice without placing the stigma of felon upon him, and through him, upon his innocent wife and children. But even if the offense be extraditable the evil cannot be reduced so long as the Courts do not enforce the law, as has been the case in San Francisco, and to a large extent, in New York City. It is likely that by concerted effort, a sufficiently strong public sentiment could be aroused to influence the judicial authorities to realize the gravity of the problem. But even with this aroused public sentiment, little could be effected so long as our courts are overburdened with work and their calendars clogged. In most of the States no provision is made for public out-door relief. Therefore the financial burden of the evil of desertion is not felt by the State, but by the private relief agencies. Because the public shoe does not pinch, the delinquents are, under present conditions, dealt with leniently, hastily and in haphazard fashion. Possibly one method to arouse the courts would be for relief agencies to turn the families of deserters over to the public charities; but this would in most States mean the disruption of the family, an evil more serious to the relief agency than the expense of maintaining the family.

Desertion being a peculiar form of delinquency in which the wife and children are doubly the victims, the conviction has been growing that special provisions should be made for State supervision. The conditions of the Courts, particularly the inferior courts, are anything but helpful to a wise, just and judicious disposition of the cases. In many courts the conditions are degrading. Dissatisfaction with the conditions in New York has produced the advocacy of a special court to deal with all cases of domestic relations, suggested, by Bernhard Rabbino before the Society of Jewish Social Workers in 1905. The suggestion has been submitted to the New York Legislative Commission to inquire into Inferior Courts, supported in a modified form by both the United Hebrew Charities and the Educational Alliance. With the existence of such a court, the law of desertion could be modified to

meet its requirements, possibly without stamping the offender as a felon, and yet as effective as the law making the offense a felony. It is commonly agreed that in desertion cases as in other cases of domestic difficulties, the courts should be employed only as a last resort. A special court of this character would probably do its most effective work in reconciling the deserter to his family and insuring for the children what to them is most necessary,—the integrity and completeness of home life.

Probably the most satisfactory results met with in legal attempts to prevent desertion have been realized in the District of Columbia. There the cases have been handled exclusively by the Juvenile Court and as far as that Court has jurisdiction over cases of child abandonment, no questions have been raised. If it is conceded that the Juvenile Court has been established as much to protect children as to adjudicate their delinquencies, the trial of deserting fathers would logically come within its scope. William C. Baldwin, of Washington, who has been very active in this work, wrote me recently that 20 per cent. of all the cases tried there in the Juvenile Court were desertion cases, numbering 899; that of these 147 were discharged, 38 were reconciled, 106 imprisoned, 608 placed under bond to support the wife. As is seen, it is only in a small minority of the cases that the penalty of the law (making the offense a misdemeanor) was inflicted. In the vast majority the men were placed under suspended sentence for the support of the families. For the past 3½ years, provision in the law has been made for the payment of fifty cents per day to the family of the imprisoned men for each day's hard labor performed while under sentence, and as the law always requires that the imprisonment shall be at hard labor, this gives the family \$3.00 per week.

The excellent results obtained are due largely, he writes, to this particular provision because it warrants the Judge in sentencing a man in all cases, where he deserves it, without being influenced by the plea of a relentless wife who fears that if the man is imprisoned, all support will stop. Since the law was enacted, the total collections by the Court for men under suspended sentence amounted to over \$80,000; the amount earned by men under sentence by hard labor and paid over to the families was over \$3,600.

Mr. Baldwin's success having been so remarkable, his suggestions for checking the evil deserve serious consideration, and I therefore quote the following paragraph of his letter in its entirety :

"As to suggestions for checking the evil, the first requisite is an adequate law which will permit the Court to deal with the family as a whole. Any law which by referring only to the children excludes the wife from its operation is unscientific and cannot be satisfactory. The offense should not be felony because the object is not to punish the man or inflict an unnecessary stigma upon him, but to oblige him to properly support his wife and children. The provision for a moderate payment to the family while the man is in prison, if he requires punishment, is essential because it relieves the greatest difficulty in the administration of the law, which is the correlative punishment of the family in an effort to reach the offender. Having this machinery, the court is likely to take a greater interest in such cases because of the possibility of effective administration. It is discouraging to a magistrate, after having arrested a man who, as the evidence clearly shows should be punished, to have the wife plead that he be given another trial and all the work which has been done, nullified for the benefit of a man who is simply trying to escape the deserved punishment. It will help to check the evil if instead of encouraging the impression that a man cannot be extradited unless the offense is made a felony, to emphasize the fact that the deserter should be and can be, with proper effort, extradited and brought back to every State where the offense is a misdemeanor. Every such extradition helps all the States and there are many of them in which this statute exists. A united effort in this direction would have a great effect in discouraging desertion."

With a comprehensive law like that enacted in Washington, administered through the Juvenile Court, already tried and found successful, it would probably be wiser to advocate a similar system in the other cities of the country rather than to urge the creation of a Domestic Relations Court, which has not yet been tried and the establishment of which would entail increased municipal budgets. But be that as it may, it cannot be doubted in the light of the information secured, which shows that family desertion is

due chiefly to the self-indulgence of the deserter, that the hope for the reduction of the evil lies not with the charity organization, but with the State or Municipality. Whereas, the problem is not a Jewish one any more than a general one, all organizations affected should unite in an effort to secure some well defined plan of action, which should be uniformly applied through legislation in all the States of the Union.

## FORMS FOR STUDY OF DESERTION.

(Similar forms to be followed in all respects by the non-Jewish charities of the same city.)

## EXTENT OF DESERTION.

Total number of applicants for the year.  
 Number of desertion cases for the year.  
 Proportion of desertion cases to total number of cases.  
 Total relief expenditures.  
 Proportion of relief expenditures for desertion cases.  
 Increase or decrease, and reason therefor.

## CAUSES OF DESERTION.

<i>Subjective.</i>	<i>Objective.</i>
Immorality:	Search for work.
(a) of husband.	Insufficient wages.
(b) of wife.	Interference of relatives.
(c) of both.	Illness:
Bad habits in general.	(a) husband's.
Gambling.	(b) wife's.
Intemperance.	
Shiftlessness.	
Incompatibility of temper.	

## SUBSIDIARY CAUSES.

(Each to be arranged in relation to each cause, in accordance with attached tabular form.)

Age of deserter.  
 Occupation and earnings.  
 Physical condition.



Interval between arrival in U. S. of husband and wife.  
 Difference in nativity of spouses.  
 Disparity in age between spouses.  
 Birth of child an incident.  
 Frequency of desertion.  
 Interval of desertions.  
 Number of the marriage.

RETURN OF HUSBAND IN RELATION TO EACH CAUSE.

(Study of the cases applying the previous who have not applied this year.)

Occupation of deserter.

Comparison of given cause with cause ascertained after return of husband.

Cause of return in comparison with cause of desertion.

Length of time deserter was away.

THE DESERTER AND THE LAW.

Quote the law of desertion.

If the law is different from former law, has it reduced the evil?

If not, why not?

Are the courts helpful?

Does the character of the court militate against a proper disposition of the case?

Is provision made by law for the maintenance of family during man's incarceration?

If so, what allowance?

How many cases of desertion and non-support appeared in Court during the year?

How many Jewish?

Of these, How many dismissed?

How many discharged under suspended sentence?

How many reconciled?

How many imprisoned?

Would a domestic relations court be helpful?

Would you advise these cases adjudicated in Juvenile Court?

Would a Central Bureau of Information concerning deserters be helpful?

Have you any other suggestions to offer to reduce the evil?





PRESIDENT HOLLANDER: The Conference is to be congratulated upon having heard so admirable a presentation of the subject and careful, critical analysis. It seems to me to present exactly the topic to take up and engage the attention of this Conference. It has been supplied, as I stated at the outset, to several members of the Conference, at whose hands it will receive now some critical discussion. Let me repeat this: That in the interest of collective economy, fifteen minutes will be permitted as the maximum to each person whose name appears on the program. Within a minute of the expiration of the maximum time I will tap the bell, and again at the conclusion of the fifteen minutes.

#### DISCUSSION.

By MAX SENIOR,

CINCINNATI, OHIO.

After the able paper that Mr. Waldman has given us, it is almost impossible to add anything.

New York experiences are unquestionably unique. No other city can offer such a wealth of material. A city which refuses to adopt federation, and which calmly rejects a million-dollar gift must necessarily be in a class by itself.

It must be pointed out that in villages like Cincinnati, with limited experience, where perhaps one or two cases will suffice to provide the basis for statistics for a certain year, statistics are of little value.

Let us bear in mind, while considering the extent of desertion among Jews, that not all Jewish cases or Gentile cases come to the various charitable organizations, and that probably in considering the morality of Jews it would be well to take into consideration the records of the divorce courts, as well as the records of the charitable organizations.

The little town which I represent has comparatively little to offer in connection with this discussion. The total number of desertion cases on our pension list is only four. In all these four cases there was normal delinquency on the part of the husband. There is an unique feature in our handling of the ordinary desertion cases: A woman, applying to our charitable organization

and stating that her husband has deserted, is informed that the charitable organization does not extend any help whatever to deserted women—that the woman must apply to the Ohio Humane Society for advice and relief. The Ohio Humane Society is an organization chartered under the State of Ohio to do work of this character, to bring the delinquent husband to task and provides the machinery by which they may be compelled to do their duty by their families. The object, of course, is this—we feel that there is a tendency on the part of Jews to rely upon the charitable organizations; that there is a great disinclination to go to law, and especially to a man who wears a blue uniform, which the officers of the Humane Society wear. On applying to the Humane Society, the first demand made is that the woman shall swear out a warrant for the arrest of her husband for desertion, which she is naturally very much disinclined to do. In the course of a short time, if the desertion is not a permanent desertion, this action brings news of the husband. In a large proportion of the cases we have had, the woman does during the course of a month become aware of the whereabouts of her husband, and we have found that this method brings the information quicker than we would be able to get it ourselves.

I will say that support is given the deserted family, by us, through the Humane Society, but the family is not aware of the fact that we pay the bill.

I find that in the limited number of cases that we have had—in 1908 I think there were 18 or 20—the husbands returned or were reunited with the family in some other city in all except 2 cases within 60 days. So that in a large proportion of the cases the desertion was not due to delinquency. In almost all cases the family had been known to be receiving charitable assistance before the desertion took place. It would seem to me, therefore, that the majority of Jewish desertions are due to insufficient earnings. It is rather hard, and in some cases impossible for the husband to support the family; he moves on to other points to improve his condition, and this is confirmed by the fact that in many cases the desertion is coincident with the birth of a child, which imposes new burdens on the family.

One other thing in connection with this subject occurs to me, that it would be exceedingly necessary to arrive at a definite definition of what you would call desertion. The Cincinnati organization's definition of desertion is that the man leaves the city and leaves his wife without means for a period of time, no matter how short, even though the woman may be at all times cognizant of the whereabouts of her husband. It seems to me that if you are going to make a statistical study it is necessary first to establish this definition as a basis of your work, and as long as it is not established, it seems to me that the statistics of Baltimore, New York, San Francisco and other places would be valueless.

DISCUSSION—(*Continued*).

By BENJAMIN TUSKA, ESQ.,

NEW YORK, N. Y.

A consideration of Mr. Waldman's masterly treatise has led me to write down a few of the thoughts it has suggested, and, with your permission, I shall read them to you.

The primary reason for considering the problem of desertion at a conference of philanthropic workers is not because of the religious, social or moral questions involved, but that of dependency.

Were it not for the demands either upon public or private charity or upon the bounty of relatives and friends that desertion cases entail, there would be none but ethical or philosophical aspects to the problem. Desertion—it is necessary to recall an obvious fact—is not limited to the poor. In one form or another it pervades all classes of society. It is, however, among the proletariat that, when desertion takes place, a case arises for charitable relief.

In other words, it is not that we are considering desertion, but desertion coupled with non-support. Not because of desertion, but on account of the element of non-support, charity must intervene and society must be protected by law.

If we will fasten clearly in our minds this distinction, we shall be able to approach the problem whenever it arises in a more honest, open and human way.

Open because our view will not be warped by prejudice or passion that arise from the indignation we necessarily feel because

of the deserted wife and child, and human because it will be affected by some of the considerations that at times drive even the poor to separate as well as the rich.

In his admirable paper, Mr. Waldman made an exhaustive classification of the causes of desertion, as gathered from numerous cases coming under his observation. These I should, however, summarize as follows:

Economic conditions, health, incompatibility, misunderstandings, dissipation, immorality, adventurousness, early foreign marriages, immigration of the husband ahead of his family.

After all, the causes are not the things with which we are concerned so much as the results. The cause can only move our pity, call forth our resentment or have an effect upon our bounty.

You will readily see the universality of social law. Those mentioned are causes of separation among the favored classes as well as among our humbler fellow-beings. When it comes to natural law, there seems to be the same for the rich as for the poor. You create absolutely no essential distinction by calling it separation in one case and desertion in the other. Where the prosperous man has decided to leave his wife, if he does not arrange with her, her lawyers arrange with him. He has the wherewithal to make the arrangements, and her lawyers have an object in fighting. When desertion takes place among the poor, there being usually nothing for the family to live upon but the current joint earnings, the wife cannot afford to engage the compelling power of private law, but is obliged to appeal to the commissioners of charity or the overseers of the poor, and these officials, to protect the purse of the town or county, undertake, if the deserter is within their jurisdiction, to have him bound over to pay a small weekly amount toward the support of wife and children.

Out of this practice there has, in most places, been developed, by legislation, of course, a procedure in police courts, before justices of the peace and committing magistrates, of holding the deserter in default of a bond to contribute toward the support of the family. Just to what lengths magistrates will go in order to enforce the law depends to some extent upon the temperament of the official and his viewpoint, but to a greater degree upon the complainant.



In most instances the latter is the wife. Commitment of the husband is about the worst thing that could happen to her, and she knows it. The position is, of course, different if the wife and children become public charges. There the complainant, as well as the informant, is the community. The communal and legal standpoint is the one dictated by self-interest. We must save the community the expense. So long as the city does not have to pay, the courts will not be more eager than the wife to hold the deserter.

Now this is a condition of public mind for which private charity, organized or otherwise, seems to be responsible, for, on account of the activity of charity, private or organized, in giving relief to deserted families, courts are not anxious to inflict punishment, except in those cases where the prosecution has been initiated by public officers. With the growth in our cities of huge philanthropic societies, the result of this tacit policy has been to transfer to the charities more and more of the public burdens, so that eventually these, in turn, have found themselves confronted with this great and growing problem of desertion, coupled with non-support—in other words, of abandonment. The causes that ordinarily bring about desertion in a homogeneous community act in a more aggravated way in the large cities that for years have been receiving enormous foreign immigration. The problem grows, the demands for relief increase in geometrical proportions, while the funds of charity only in arithmetical ratio. What was personal in the almsgiving of a generation ago becomes a tax, and we all know that tax-dodging is not confined to the imports, excises and taxes that are levied by governmental authority.

So scientific charity, to which Mr. Waldman has alluded, but which has almost become a screen behind which to shelter scientific selfishness, steps in to contrive a remedy. The same impulse that has led to the protection of the town from those thrust upon it seizes organized charity, and we have laws, promoted by private charities, making abandonment a crime.

It is a peculiar thing in New York City, but perhaps it is true of the country generally, viz, that what I shall have to call the Missouri doctrine is applied to every bit of new legislation; that the public, including those charged with the enforcement of laws



do not, or pretend not to, believe that a legislative enactment is really a law until the courts actually prove it to them. Therefore, you will not be surprised that when, after the passage of the New York law of 1905 against abandonment, the Educational Alliance, through its Legal Aid Bureau, undertook to bring flagrant cases of desertion, coupled with destitution, before the District Attorney for indictment and extradition, that official was slow to act, being impressed with the idea that the funds at hand for extradition would better be used for offenses of a more public character than abandonment, and perhaps that the statutory declaration of the criminal character of abandonment was sufficient to operate as a self-executing reformation of society in that particular.

The history of the work among our people in New York will be of some interest to this gathering.

In 1899 the Educational Alliance undertook, in an experimental way, the conduct of a legal aid dispensary. About twenty lawyers divided up Sundays for several months. There was found to be a real need. We kept telling the public from time to time of this need until at last there was a response. A broad-minded philanthropist from Pittsburg, Henry Phipps, came forward with the sum of \$2,500 for this work. The Bureau was organized in 1902. Of course, it has grown. At times the staff has consisted of three—now only two—paid lawyers, three or four stenographers, a clerk—who is also an investigator—an office boy and a process server. Mr. Phipps has annually made to us the donation with which we were enabled to begin the work, not to mention his other benefactions for our general purposes.

From the start we found that marital cases constituted a fair proportion of the business. Our policy was conciliation where the issue was domestic difference, and where it was non-support application to a magistrate when moral suasion and threats proved powerless. We also had abandonment cases, but for lack of funds could do very little beyond corresponding with other agencies where the deserter had left the city. It was then that we promoted legislation against abandonment. During this time the United Hebrew Charities had a great many cases of destitution due to abandonment. It was extending relief to deserted families, making in-

vestigations, and in many instances providing the transportation for the wife to reach the deserting spouse. To avoid duplication an agreement was reached whereby for one year we were to take over all of its desertion work, erecting a special bureau for that purpose, the Charities contributing toward its support and providing transportation wherever needed. This arrangement worked well for that year, after which its own necessities led to the withdrawal of the monetary support of the Charities, though, in justice to that body, it must be said, it did not deprive the Alliance of the work. From that time on the Educational Alliance has been charged with the legal end of the abandonment cases. In March of this year the relationship of the two societies was defined in the following protocol:

First, the applicant who claims to have been abandoned and is in need of immediate assistance is to be referred to the United Hebrew Charities.

Second, cases where the applicant is not in need of relief are to be taken up by the Educational Alliance as usual.

Third, cases taken up by the Educational Alliance that turn out to need relief are to be referred to the United Hebrew Charities with full report of the investigations of the Educational Alliance.

Fourth, all legal work in connection with abandonment cases whether in the hands of the United Hebrew Charities or the Educational Alliance is to be performed either by the Educational Alliance or in its name.

About a year ago we consolidated and reorganized the Legal Aid and Desertion Bureaus, and they are now under the able management of Mr. Sobel, who is to read you a paper upon legal aid work.

The methods that have been found by our Legal Aid Bureau to work well in practice consist in taking the statement of the deserted woman and her friends, investigating the facts, tracing the husband in town and if out of town communicating with Jewish relief organizations, if any, in the place where the husband is supposed to be, and if there be no such charitable society then getting in touch with the local congregation or the local lodge, if there be any. If no trace of the deserter is found, an account, together with a photograph of the missing man, is published in

the Yiddish press, who have placed their columns at our disposition gratis. If the husband is found in or near the city of New York efforts are made to bring him to a sense of duty through personal appeal. Not infrequently that results in some arrangement satisfactory to the wife. Failing that, there are Magistrates' Courts, and in serious cases the District-Attorney's office. Sometimes indictments are procured against runaways. Sometimes the authorities at the place where the deserter is found are asked to act. In the latter event, there is the expense of sending out the wife; in the former, of sending out an officer in connection with extradition. Where the wife has been sent out to prosecute on the spot, the expenses have had to be met by the Charities; where an officer has been sent out to bring back the indicted deserter, we have, as within the last few days in a case located in Detroit, provided the fare without the State. Since the present year a more liberal view of expenditures has been taken by the District-Attorney, but there is still a difference in degree of liberality between the prosecuting officers of Brooklyn and New York. The particular method to be adopted, that is, whether the wife should be sent to meet her husband or the husband brought back to face his wife, depends entirely upon all the circumstances in each specific case.

For the obvious reason that relief of the family rather than punishment of the offender is desired, resort to drastic measures is not had by the Educational Alliance, except in extreme cases.

That you may have an idea of what is doing by way of prosecution, let me refer to a report made to me in the month of March of this year.

*S vs. S*, husband extradited from Detroit, and failing to file a bond satisfactory to the Legal Aid Bureau was sentenced to not less than one year and not more than two years and in addition to pay a fine of \$1,000.

In *re Z*, precisely the same disposition was made as in *S vs. S*.

In *re F*, in the U. S. Army in Virginia, after assigning \$10 of his monthly pay, sentence was suspended to enable him to serve out his enlistment and obtain an honorable discharge.

In *re N*, the wife was sent to Albany, where it was found that the husband had another wife. Upon his plea of guilty he was sentenced to three years.

These cases have been widely advertised in the Yiddish press for their deterrent effect.

Our greatest trouble consists in the effort to avoid becoming a divorce bureau. Many a deserted wife does not so much want support as she craves freedom so as to marry again. The importunities to render assistance in such cases are great, but we must leave the clients to seek other counsel. It sometimes happens that a deserter, through his representatives, will offer adequate provision for support if only the wife will sue for divorce. These are very delicate questions, and, while the Bureau does not shirk its duty, it does not desire the business.

We are constantly in receipt of letters from husbands and their friends, stating their side of the case and asking assistance. Recently a man came on from Iowa to explain his brother's side.

Such is the position that the Bureau has made for itself that it is frequently consulted by the District-Attorney and Judges of the General Sessions, as well as by philanthropic workers throughout the country.

The question of abandonment is complicated so far as the orthodox Jewish immigrant is concerned by two propositions. (1) The validity of his marriage from a civil viewpoint in the land of his origin; (2) his right to rely upon the "get" or ritual or religious divorce. In several of the countries of Continental Europe for marriage to be valid it is not enough that it be solemnized by a minister, there must be the civil ceremony. Hence, as in *Matter of Hall*, 61 App. Div. 266, parties have found themselves on arriving in America not legally married, except in those States where the courts have approved unregulated common-law marriage. Therefore, when a party to such a marriage decamps there is apt not to be abandonment in the criminal sense, nor in the view of the Poor Law. It has likewise been held that the "get" or ritual divorce, if valid in the foreign jurisdiction, will be given effect in the courts of New York. (*Leshinsky vs. Leshinsky*, 5 Misc. 495.)

Now the immigrant from Russia or Southeastern Europe finds himself occasionally in this dilemma. A foreign rabbinical divorcee may be respected just as is a foreign religious marriage. In his own country the rabbi is officially recognized as the legal head of the local Jewish congregation, and as such may dispense justice in his community, solemnize marriages, grant divorcees and perform other acts which will be valid; and this immigrant, brought up under such institutions, regarding the acts of his rabbi as not merely religious, but legal, brings these ideas and institutions with him to America, which he understands is the land of religious liberty, and undertakes to practise them here sometimes with disastrous results, by reason of the failure to appreciate that religious liberty has, under our law, a well-defined meaning, and that wherever it invades the rights of the community or runs counter to public policy the individual must yield.

There was a practice, not very extensive, but sufficient to be called to the attention of the Legal Aid Bureau of the Alliance, of granting these religious divorcees. That has been stopped in New York through a law which the Alliance was instrumental in having enacted, making it a misdemeanor for any person to assume to issue a bill of divorce before the parties had obtained a divorce in the civil courts.

What with organized charity doing for the community—and much remains to be done, but if systematized relief did all that the claims upon it demand, require and are entitled to—misery, while alleviated, would not be extinguished. There will always be enough for gentle souls to do; there will always be place for personal and private charity, growing out of love for one's fellow-man, as distinguished from the relief afforded by organized society and societies from a sense of duty and of self-preservation. It is true that private charity may go by favor, but that is its privilege. The funds of communal institutions, however, must be applied along lines planned with respect to the amount that can be obtained and the amelioration of destitution, together with treatment of its cause.

With some of Mr. Waldman's conclusions I find myself in accord; to others I must dissent. His suggested general classification is valuable. Desertion is caused by outside conditions such



as economic pressure and by personal weakness, of which there are many examples. That there is very much value in a statistical study of the various specific causes, I cannot admit. That the money of charitable societies should be so employed, I protest. Your desertion census is not going to bring about the millenium nor even alleviate the trouble. Desertion is one of those evils of human nature, ineradicable so long as present social and economic conditions prevail. The vast number of desertions seem in one way or another traceable to economic stress, whether that be the proximate cause of the desertion or the remote cause through an improvident or an affectionless marriage.

It is the lesser number that are distinctly attributable to human weakness and a still less number directly to downright viciousness. Where you have the latter, the community does not suffer by prosecution of the offender and charity does not have its burden increased by putting him away. Where, on the other hand, the causes are largely economic, the imprisonment of the offender on account of the dishonor entailed tends to harden him and thereby to place the family in a position of danger. There is the wide middle ground where reliance must be had upon the discretion and sound judgment of wise magistrates and sympathetic prosecutors.

Here is where, like the Children's Court, a Court of Domestic Relations would serve a useful function—not a court where a single magistrate or two would preside from one year's end to the next, but one wherein all committing magistrates would rotate, bringing to their task the larger viewpoint that ripe judgment obtains from being in touch officially with all phases of magisterial work. Such a court, with its rotating features, the Educational Alliance advocated before the Small Courts Commission, and has by that body been recently recommended to the Legislature of the State of New York.\* Should such a division of our Magistrates' Court be created with the District of Columbia provision of hard labor for the offender supplying some modicum of support to the family, and the Kansas method of parole, the experience therein obtained will doubtless in time lead to the devising of valuable experimental, remedial legislation.

---

\* Since this paper was read these suggestions have been embodied in the *Laws of New York*, Ch. 659, Laws of 1910.



DISCUSSION—(*Continued*).

By A. S. NEWMAN,

Superintendent Hebrew Relief Association,

CLEVELAND, O.

A short time ago I called at the home of a man whose wife had just arrived from Europe. The man had been here for some time, and spoke English quite well. The woman, shortly after her arrival, had heard the word loafer frequently used in the neighborhood where she lived, and, while I was there, said to her husband in German: "Will you please tell me what a loafer is?" The man looked puzzled for a moment, and then replied: "A loafer—why a loafer is a human being, just like other human beings, only he is a loafer."

This applies as well to deserters. A deserter is a human being, just like other human beings, only he is a deserter. Not much more than this at any rate is generally known about deserters, until a splendidly thorough, analytical study of the subject, such as we just had presented to us by Mr. Waldman, is at our disposal.

I am sure that Mr. Waldman's paper will be carefully perused with interest by every practical charity worker receiving a copy of the proceedings of this Conference.

Like all good papers, Mr. Waldman's statement of the situation is self-explanatory, and requires no extended comment on my part.

Mr. Waldman has given us practically everything that a study of the subject can reveal. He has diagnosed the desertion problem, has given us all the data and phenomena pertaining to the evil, and in probing to the bottom of the situation, has analyzed the causes of desertion in the order of their importance, and has told us in a very complete way why men leave and why they return.

I was particularly interested in Mr. Waldman's findings and statistics concerning the causes of desertion, because, in fighting most evils, if we can find out their cause we frequently can by attacking the cause eliminate the evil. Strangely enough, this does not necessarily follow in an attempt to solve the problem of desertion.

Mr. Waldman has found that self-indulgence, licentiousness, selfishness and a lack of a sense of duty, rather than poverty, un-

employment and misfortune, are the principal causes of desertion, and, moreover, cause the more chronic and prolonged types of desertion cases.

A knowledge of the fact that the deserter is not so much an unfortunate man as he is a bad man should the more readily cause us to agree with Mr. Waldman, when he says that the best weapon at our disposal against the deserter is the "strong arm of the law." Unfortunately, however, a knowledge of the causes in this particular evil of desertion does not greatly assist in preventing desertion. We cannot, it appears, solve the problem by attacking the principal causes, for it is not reasonable to expect that we can with any satisfactory degree of speed eliminate selfishness, licentiousness, self-indulgence and a lack of a sense of duty.

Since, therefore, we cannot remove the cause and, therefore, cannot entirely eliminate desertion, let us at least see what fighting measures are at hand with which to diminish the evil.

I know from Mr. Waldman's paper and from my own experience that the most persistent suggestion made is that we endeavor to have desertion made a felony in all of the States. The paper further suggests as a possibly preferable substitute that we work to the end of making a misdemeanor an extraditable offense.

In my opinion it matters little at this particular time whether the one or the other change or addition in the law be made. It is, to be sure, desirable that we have uniform laws, well adapted to the handling of desertion cases, but a lack of proper laws is not at this time the chief difficulty in the situation. Proper laws could doubtless be secured with comparative ease, and even the law as it is could be fairly well adapted to the handling of cases, if only the problem were more within our control, which it is not.

I have myself referred to the "strong arm of the law" as being the best weapon at hand, but I have noticed that this same "strong arm of the law," through enforced idleness, lacks proper exercise to keep it healthy. If it had the needed exercise, the laws would adjust themselves to the situation without much difficulty.

What degree of good, after all, can we derive at the present time from laws no matter how excellent or how stringent they may be, or how well adapted to the purpose, if we cannot get hold of de-

serters to prosecute, and the practical charity workers in the audience will readily admit that the deserter is, for the most part, far removed from the scene of action when he is wanted in court.

I was recently informed by the non-Jewish charities of our city that they doubt whether they succeed in bringing 2 per cent. of their deserters into court, and the experience of our Jewish charities during 1909 has been that out of 52 desertions only 4 of the men, or about  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent., were found and brought into court.

One particularly objectionable thing about wife-deserters is that when they depart they do not leave their addresses at either police headquarters or at the charity office. This at least is how we find it in Cleveland, and I presume that deserters are very much alike the world over in this particular.

I wish to point out, therefore, that whereas the enactment of proper laws and earnest and able prosecution of deserters is not only desirable, but necessary, we ought to give paramount attention to ways and means of apprehending absconding husbands and fathers.

At the present time we capture a deserter only very occasionally, and principally when he himself grows careless of his safety. We rarely find a deserter who is really anxious to avoid us. If the wife does not happen to hear from friends or relatives in other cities that her husband may be found there, we have practically no avenue of search for him, and even through this medium the results are very unsatisfactory.

One thing is certain, that we cannot even in the smallest degree depend upon the police, even where desertion is a felony, to find deserters. I am not sufficiently acquainted with police duties and police routine to know whether more could be reasonably expected of the police in these cases. I do know, however, that in Cleveland, when a woman has taken out a warrant for her husband's arrest it has frequently happened that the police came to look for him at our charity office and at the woman's home. I have reason to believe that this was the entire extent of their search.

It is, therefore, very evident that the law and the police of their own initiative accomplish very little in these cases, and, as the wives rarely get a clew to the whereabouts of the real deserter, some

further plan must be suggested, if we are to make any satisfactory headway in diminishing desertions.

I therefore desire in part to suggest, and in part to inquire, whether there is any reason why it would not be good to give a much greater amount of publicity to desertions than we have heretofore been giving.

I do not know just how many Yiddish papers there are in the country, or the exact extent of their circulation, but I do know that they reach the working classes very extensively. I understand that New York City has 4 Yiddish daily papers, that Chicago has 2, San Francisco has 1, Montreal has 1, that St. Louis has or had 1, that Atlanta, Ga., has 1, and we have a Jewish daily paper in Cleveland. There doubtless are more of these papers than I have enumerated. One Yiddish daily in New York, I understand, already conducts, on a small scale, what is known by them as their "Gallery of Deserting Men." They reproduce the photograph of the deserter and print some description of the matter.

I am inclined to think that an elaboration of this plan would prove to be a practical weapon in the fight against desertion.

If we were to make arrangements with the various Yiddish papers, have a few cuts for printing purposes of our chronic deserters made, and have these as widely published as can be reasonably done, we would thereby not only succeed in finding out the whereabouts of various deserters, but, I particularly wish to emphasize, that through this publicity, we would create an atmosphere of danger to the deserter, which does not at present exist, and which would, I believe, be the greatest deterrent to desertion which we can employ.

The editor of our Cleveland paper thinks the plan is practical, and gives it as his opinion that the papers in other cities would also doubtless cheerfully take up the matter.

Although it is the opinion of the same gentleman that the various papers would make only a very limited charge for this work, it is evident that an extensive publicity campaign would involve a certain amount of expense to each organization, the amount varying with the number of desertions advertised.

It should here be noted that the deserter who absents himself from home for a long period, for the most part, resides in the large cities.

I understand that one Jewish daily in New York has a circulation of over 100,000, and I know that it reaches quite a number of working men in cities other than New York. One New York deserter was captured in Cleveland only last week through the reproduction of his photograph in one of the papers, and I was particularly impressed recently with the desirability of carrying out this publicity plan, when the reproduction of the photograph of one of our Cleveland deserters in a New York daily resulted in the man's arrest in the city of Pittsburg, through the report of a fellow-workman, who had recognized him by means of the description in the paper.

At the present time, without this weapon of publicity held over the deserter's head, he wanders about at his own pleasure, with practically no risk of arrest, and even if through some accident, he be apprehended and convicted, he frequently, at the expiration of his time, departs for even a longer period than before, because he will not live with a wife who has caused him the pain and humiliation of imprisonment.

If, however, he were aware that he will be described in the papers, and incur great risk of recapture and reimprisonment, he may be more likely to accept the ills that he has "than fly to others," of which he has had previous sad experience.

If, for instance, a New York deserter, who has taken up his residence in Cleveland, should some morning find his photograph reproduced in the Cleveland Jewish daily paper, and should, at the same time realize, that if he went from Cleveland to Chicago, that the papers there might also be similarly advertising him, he might, to say the least, feel somewhat embarrassed over the situation, and would probably seriously consider a return to his family, rather than run the risk of being brought back by a deputy sheriff to face trial.

It should in this connection be mentioned that after a period of careful observation, we have found in our Cleveland experience that fully seventy-five per cent. of the wives are able to furnish photo-



graphs of the men. In some instances they are secured from friends and relatives of the man, and in other cases it is necessary to go to the photographer who made the photograph.

A further possibility would be the printing of circulars, which can be cheaply secured in quantities and distributed at such points as settlement houses, labor union headquarters, depending upon the man's trade, and in such factories as employ men of the trade followed by the deserter.

As I have stated before, the important thing is to create an atmosphere of danger.

Before dismissing the subject, I desire to say that I do not claim for this plan that it is more than one of the fighting measures which it may be possible to employ. There may even be reasons known to some of the workers here assembled why the plan is not feasible, but I think it worth while bringing before this assemblage for consideration and discussion.

I speak of the matter as much in the way of inquiry as in the way of suggestion.

I have noted with great interest Mr. Waldman's advocacy of the handling of desertion exclusively through the Juvenile Court, in order that the family may be dealt with as a unit. Mr. Waldman's thorough summing up of this phase of the question is very convincing, and I am perhaps particularly in sympathy with his remarks, because we are working in that direction in Cleveland.

I must, however, say a word concerning Mr. William C. Baldwin's communication to Mr. Waldman, to the effect that 899 desertion cases were tried in the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia. I own that I was at first somewhat surprised at Mr. Baldwin's figures, in view of my theory that deserters are hard to find, until I took the matter up with our Juvenile Court in Cleveland, where I received information, from which I infer, that these 899 cases probably, for the most part, consisted not of instances where men had gone to other cities and were brought back, but consisted rather of local abandonment cases, in which the men had not left the District of Columbia, but had failed to support their families there by reason of drink, or shiftlessness, or vice. Our Juvenile Court



in Cleveland deals with many cases of this type, but the real deserter is not often brought into court, because he cannot be found.

I have repeatedly emphasized in this discussion the difficulty of bringing deserters to justice, but lest anyone arrive at the mistaken inference that many solutions are not reached in our desertion cases, even though it is difficult to reach deserters through the law, I wish to point out, and this also in corroboration of Mr. Waldman's findings in regard to the duration of desertion cases, that of 52 desertion cases, with which our Jewish charities of Cleveland dealt in 1909, only 18 were on the relief list on January 1, 1910.

Mr. Waldman, speaking of the Cincinnati method of not entertaining desertion cases as strictly charity propositions, points out that the method is justly and with good result applicable only to the type of case in which the deserter takes a real interest in his family, and he further points out that this type of case is, in any event, likely to be only temporary. This last fact appears to be the most hopeful element in the situation. Since then these temporary cases are not the most serious difficulty to be met, and since we can or do employ some or all of the principals of the Cincinnati method in combating with some degree of success this temporary type of case, it remains that we work out a plan to minimize the more serious and prolonged type of desertion, in which the man cares nothing for his family. I have ventured to suggest one plan, namely, that of publicity. I trust that further plans will be suggested by others.

In conclusion, I wish to join Mr. Waldman in his advocacy of our working in the direction of uniform extradition statutes, and of handling desertions through the Juvenile Court.

PRESIDENT HOLLANDER: With this the formal discussion of the paper is complete, and the subject is now before the Conference for informal discussion, for a necessarily limited time. Those who receive the floor will retain it for a maximum of five minutes.

Mrs. C. A. STIX, St. Louis: Those of you who know me must realize how, after listening for days to the able papers read at this

Conference, I welcome an open discussion, which gives me a chance to talk! The subject how to avoid wife desertion is most important, and each State has a different remedy; thus we hear many conflicting reports. Last night Mr. Mack thoroughly convinced us that in order to stop anti-immigration laws we should feel morally responsible to our government to keep all Jewish poor off of our streets, to take such care of our Jewish women and children that they need not become a burden to the State. If we fail to do this laws will be made so stringent and the barrier will be such as to close our door to all of persecuted Russia. In the report from New York 1,050 men deserted last year; in Cincinnati none, owing to their method of refusing assistance to any family where the husband has deserted. This does not seem just. Perhaps there are fewer cases needing assistance in Cincinnati compared to other cities; for example, how could New York refuse aid to a thousand helpless women, who, in taking care of their babies, fulfill their mission. Is it kind to call these women beggars? When Mr. Senior was asked what the Jewish charities do for the women really needing assistance he replied: "We send them to the Ohio Humane Society, where they are loath to beg; then a policeman in uniform meets them, so that many half-frightened turn back." These poor dejected souls who suffered such bad treatment in Russia look for more kindness than this. It is quite true you reduce the number who ask for assistance, but is that a proof they are not in want? I once attended a meeting of a day nursery, where a report was read saying: We feed our children on fewer rations and use less money than any institution of this kind." I answered: "That's no proof that the children are not hungry." We have had 1,800 years of charity giving, let the poor now have justice. The rich woman has redress, if her husband deserts; a lawyer saves her all humiliation and the court settles the amount of alimony. You should not close your charity doors to the family of a deserter, but get together and have such laws passed in every State to find and punish the deserter. Continue to aid helpless women left to care for their infants and use all of your energy, money and efforts to make the deserter pay the penalty.

DR. BORIS D. BOGEN, Cincinnati: The fact that we have no desertion or deserted women is not because we ignore them or mistreat them. On the contrary, in many instances we prevent desertion by proper treatment and by assisting poor families. The children of deserted mothers suffer no physical want, they are sent to school just as well as any other children. Our organization, however, has no direct dealings with the cases of desertion. If you imagine that by giving five or ten cents you have solved the problem you are mistaken. This spasmodic method does not count in the long run.

The deserters are human beings and the psychological reasons and causes underlying desertion must be studied if we are ever to be in position to treat them right. Many a time in our office a man threatens to desert his family: "If you do not do as I want I will desert you," he says. Sometimes he keeps his promise, but our method does not encourage desertion. We are anxious to help the children and do not want to mistreat the unfortunate women, but we do not want, through our kindness, to produce additional misery.

It is a mistake, in my opinion, for a charity worker to assume the role of a prosecuting officer. If deserters are to be prosecuted it ought to be done by another agency. We do not handle desertion cases directly, but refer them to the Ohio Humane Society (which is a police agency).

MRS. HENRY SOLOMON, Chicago: I differ from Mrs. Stix on one point. I should not consider women beggars; I believe they earn all they get, especially those of the class Mr. Waldman described this morning when he gave his reasons for wife-desertion, since upon them devolves the burden of carrying the financial question, being the housekeeper, laundress and general burden-bearer for the entire question. We have been given the Cincinnati method, which I fear would be of little value in larger communities, where large problems in every line must be met and solved. One difficult point in legislation must not be overlooked—the securing of means for transportation after a deserter is located. Often, when one is found and returned, upon his promise to return home and care for his family, the wife will refuse to testify

against him and all the effort for his return is wasted since a few weeks will find him again an offender. I am inclined to believe that uniform laws and stringent ones should be adopted and enforced until a new attitude toward desertion is created, and when a lesson has been taught we might modify them.

MR. S. B. KAUFMAN, Indianapolis: I heartily agree with the suggestions made by Mr. Newman. At the Indiana State Conference of Charities I read a paper on the same subject, and gave three suggestions:

First, uniform laws on desertion; second, the establishment of desertion bureaus in all communities; third, that there should be a central bureau, where an official organ on this subject should be published, containing a description of each deserter, his personal appearance and occupation, and that this paper be sent to each bureau, from which point a search should be made for the deserter by the local officer, with the co-operation of the people.

I suggest that the National Conference of Jewish Charities should publish a paper under its auspices, where the pictures and descriptions of all deserters could be published. The paper can also be a medium to promote the interest and the uplifting of Jewish philanthropy.

About a year ago a deserter was discovered in Indianapolis through the *Jewish Forwards*. Another was discovered at Montreal, Canada. We believe if an organ would be published, in which we could give publicity and have descriptions of all deserters, and also have the co-operation from all the communities in the country, seventy-five per cent. of the deserters would be apprehended.

MR. CYRUS L. SULZBERGER, New York: It seems to me that there is one point in connection with this matter that was touched upon by Mr. Waldman, but perhaps not sufficiently emphasized, and that appears to have been overlooked by those who discussed the paper, and that is as to the origin of Jewish desertion cases and the way in which they differ from desertions ordinarily, like everything else connected with our problem.

A few years ago I visited Russia and Roumania for the purpose of seeing the conditions as they were. I found that in Roumania there was practically no wife desertion. Now why is it these people who do not desert in their own country do desert when they get here? How do they come here? What happens in that two or three years that they are here in advance of their families? The man gets into a factory in the city, works side by side with Americanized people, and after he has accumulated sufficient funds sends for his family, and when his wife arrives he is shocked to find that whereas he has become an American and has associated with Americans his wife is a far different being.

The fact is the man doesn't realize the difference until his wife arrives and shows him the contrast of the conditions under which he has been working and the squalid environments the woman has just come from. After a separation of three years, he in the new environment and his wife in the old, she is subjected to a trial that she would not have had if they had been allowed, as they have the right, to live out their lives in a land of civilization, instead of a land of oppression.

MISS MIRIAM KALISKY, Chicago: I think we are making progress in all our charitable efforts, but in one respect we are forging ahead in Illinois, and that is in our laws. For instance, we had a case of desertion, and over two weeks ago we brought the man back to Chicago, Ill. I think it was late on Tuesday evening when he was brought back. The next morning he was prosecuted. His wife refused to prosecute. Nevertheless, the judge pronounced a sentence of six months. Later the man was set free on his own bond, but he has to report to the court at certain times, until the expiration of the six months, and if he fails to report or deserts his family again the sentence of the court will at once become effective. I believe that is the only remedy for desertion. It is true, when the man comes to this country his wife is ignorant, they live in some dark Russian settlement, she has a house full of children and their home is small. I think by lending ourselves



to her, teaching her how to take care of her home, we will be showing her the only way to keep the man at home.

MR. G. A. BERLINSKY, Louisville: In all the discussion this morning, following the paper on desertion, and in the report itself, everything has applied to the cases of desertion after the man has left his family. The keynote as to preventing desertion has not been sounded. Dr. Bogen speaks of Cincinnati: Cincinnati claims it has few cases of desertion and its workers think they know why they have so few—giving as the reason the fact that instead of their desertion cases being handled directly by the charity organization they are handled under their direction through the Humane Society, with its uniformed officers. My opinion is that Cincinnati has so few cases of desertion for other reasons—Cincinnati has more than ordinary charity work. Their charities, social settlement and correlated activities, work hand in hand, and through this service they know their people; not only those receiving charity but those above the poverty line, on the verge of charity; they know their weaknesses, and through efficient social service prevent desertion.

Mr. Waldman's report does not show in how many desertion cases the families had the help and guidance of friendly visitors, contact with social settlements or the services of visiting nurses. Surely prevention is a more important factor in the question of desertion than work after the man is gone, and the family is left on the hands of the charities.

We learn from the report that in many cases desertion is due to incompatibility. Here is a field for social endeavor; to bring about a better understanding between the husband who preceded his wife in the emigration to America, and who quickly acquires different ways and standards, and the newly arrived wife.

We are told also that immorality plays an important part in the problem. I believe that when our social service reaches a higher state of efficiency and the standard of living is raised the number of desertions will diminish. Our organization (in Louisville) is paying more attention to prevention of desertion than to plans for the punishment of deserters upon their return.



MR. JACOB BILLIKOPF, Kansas City: The subject of wife abandonment, so ably and comprehensively discussed by Mr. Waldman in his excellent paper, presents so many difficulties that it is impossible to suggest any one remedy which will solve this great problem. The recommendations made by the previous speakers possess a good deal of merit and deserve careful consideration.

In the few minutes allowed me I wish to present briefly a scheme, operative in our city, which is attracting considerable attention. It possesses certain features calculated to check, in a measure, at least, the evil of wife desertion.

A little over a year ago there was created in our city, under a special ordinance introduced in the Council, a Board of Pardons and Paroles, whose function it is to supervise the local penal institutions and to deal with such offenders as have been committed to the workhouse for the violation of some municipal ordinance. At the weekly meetings of the Board the secretary, who attends every session of the Municipal Court, presents the cases of such individuals as in his judgment are deserving of parole. When released on probation the man is furnished with a written statement of the terms and the conditions of his parole, and is impressed with the fact that upon violation of any of his promises he will be sent back to the workhouse for a period of three times the unexpired term. The same applies to women. Two things are insisted upon at all times—honest employment and a respectable living place. In his weekly report to the secretary he is obliged to give his place of employment, place of residence, wages and expenses in detail.

Now, then, from January 1, 1909, *i. e.*, since the establishment of the Board, until January 1, 1910, a period of twelve months, 885 persons were paroled. The records show that 78, or only 9%, subsequently committed further infractions of the law, and that at least 70% reported quite regularly and conducted themselves satisfactorily.

Being a member of this Board, I have had abundant opportunity to observe its operation, and I can say that in one feature of its work the Board has been particularly successful, and that is in

foreing delinquent husbands and delinquent fathers to deposit with the secretary a portion of their earnings, to be applied to the maintenance of their families. Within a period of six months over \$3,000.00 has passed through the hands of the secretary, to be expended in behalf of wives and children, and this money comes from men who, were it not for the existence of the Board, would today be inmates of the workhouse and their families dependent upon the charities for support.

In this connection I take the liberty to cite a concrete case, a description of which will give you some idea of the methods we pursue in the solution of cases involving the problem of family neglect.

#### CASE OF H. L.

Police Court, No. 18231.

H. L.—Tailor by trade. Fined \$500.00. September 23, 1909; married; has 4 children, ages 10, 8, 6 and 4 years, respectively; lives on Missouri Avenue.

#### *Police Court Testimony.*

This man was prosecuted for wife abandonment and non-support. On four or five different occasions he deserted his family, leaving them in the most destitute circumstances and at the mercy of the charities. Each time he was warned that if he repeated the offense he would be prosecuted vigorously, but such threats had little effect upon him. Without any provocation and whenever the spirit moved him, which was quite frequently, he would go away from the city and would return as unceremoniously within three or four months after his departure. It was found out later that the man had an affinity in Chicago, and whenever he would save up a few dollars he would join her. On the particular morning on which he was brought into court his wife could not appear against him, as she was in a rather precarious condition. The only defense the man had to make in his own behalf was that his wife did not mind him and was too independent.

It would seem, though, that none of his pleas had any effect on the judge, and he was fined \$500.00, which is equivalent to a year in the workhouse, for repeatedly neglecting his family. On the same day he was sent to the workhouse. But five days later Mr. L. was paroled by the Board and signed the following pledge:

In consideration of parole granted me this date, I hereby agree to obey the laws and support my family, and to report every Saturday night to the office of the secretary for one year.

I also agree to reimburse the charities for the expenses they incurred in the maintenance of my family during my absence and to deposit \$300.00 with the Board as security against my deserting my family.

I further agree, if returned to custody by the Board for the violation of any term of this parole, to work out the balance of my unexpired sentence (\$500.00) at the rate of sixteen and two-thirds cents per day.

H. L. (his X mark).

Witnessed by FRANK P. WALSH,  
*Attorney for the Board.*

September 29, 1909—\$300.00, which L. recovered from the street car company on account of injury to his child, was put up as security by defendant and deposited by the Board in the Fidelity Trust Co.

October 6, 1909—Reported at the office of the secretary. Works at ———. Earns \$18.00 per week and lives at home.

April 1, 1910—Man has been reporting every week at the office and the family is getting along very nicely. He managed to save \$200.00.

Here, then, is the case of a man who has so repeatedly abandoned his family that he became a chronic wife deserter. He was shrewd enough to realize that society would not allow his wife and children to starve and that they would be cared for during his absence. All at once the law takes hold of him and punishes him severely for the violation of his duties. Five days in the work-

house had sufficient effect on him to impress him with a sense of responsibility to his family, and he is willing to comply with any request that is made of him. All of our wife neglect cases are, with some modifications, handled in a similar manner.

Recently our Board has adopted a scheme whereby we are taking care of such families whose bread-winner serves a sentence in the workhouse. The amount given each family depends entirely upon the needs and requirements of that particular family. In that way the wives and children do not suffer pending the prisoners' confinement in the workhouse.

As I stated before, I feel that our scheme has had a very wholesome effect and will in time check considerably the evil of wife abandonment.

MR. MORRIS D. WALDMAN, New York: I did not expect to be called upon to close this discussion. It may, however, be well to summarize the essential points, so that you may take away a clear notion from the haze and maze of statistics which have been presented. The first thing we discovered is, that it is not a Jewish question alone, but is just as prevalent among the Gentiles, and from this fact we may take unctio to our souls. Furthermore, desertion has not been on the increase. Proportionately it has been on the decrease. Furthermore, among the causes of desertion immorality does not seem to be quite as prevalent among Jews as among non-Jews. I was particularly gratified that among the desertion cases I investigated in 1902 I found only three women who had been guilty of sexual immorality. The present study, incomplete as it is, also shows that self-indulgence is the chief cause of family desertion, and that there is little relation between desertion and industrial conditions.

I am sorry that Mr. Billikopf did not present to you more emphatically the plan which Kansas City has just about introduced. I look forward with a great deal of antieipation to the results of the scheme that has been inaugurated in Kansas City for the treatment of desertion cases, as well as the treatment of other minor offenses. Just another word: the causes as they appear in my report of 1902 were crudely tabulated; in the supplementary tabular forms appearing in this report you will find the

causes a little more scientifically tabulated, and I would recommend to the Conference, if it still believes that interest in the subject ought to be continued, that these tables be submitted to a special committee for approval and then distributed to all the relief agencies in the city, so that a thorough study may be made for at least one year, the results of such investigation to be embodied in the forms I have prepared.

PRESIDENT HOLLANDER: This concludes the morning session.

Wednesday, May 18.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

PRESIDENT HOLLANDER: A single paper has been prepared and circulated in printed form among those whose names appear on the program as "Open Discussion." Upon the completion of the reading of this paper the discussion will be carried on by those whose names appear, after which it will be put before the Conference for less formal discussion.

The principal paper will now be read by Mr. David M. Bressler, of New York.

The following paper on the subject, "Removal Work, Including Galveston," was then read by the reporter, Mr. David M. Bressler, of New York:

#### THE REMOVAL WORK, INCLUDING GALVESTON.

BY DAVID M. BRESSLER,

General Manager of the Industrial Removal Office.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

It is now a little over nine years since the Industrial Removal Office was instituted. Whatever the opinion may be as to the manner and efficiency with which it has handled the work for which it was organized, there can hardly be any question in the mind of anyone familiar with the subject that it is beyond the experimental stage. It meets a definite need and helps to solve a definite problem. That the need and problem exist, no one longer questions. The solution or remedy attempted by the Removal Office, namely, the distribution of Jewish immigrants



throughout the country, was given its initial impetus at the memorable Conference of Jewish Charities held in Detroit in 1902, when the subject was presented to the Conference for the first time. The remarkable, not to say enthusiastic, sympathy and support which it evoked, is historical, and it is no exaggeration to say that even the moderate success which has accompanied the efforts of the Removal Office since that time, can be attributed directly to the influence and co-operation of the cities which were represented in that notable Conference.

How efficient the work of the Removal Office has been, can best be gathered from a perusal of the annual reports covering the years of its existence. By reason of the fact that the high water mark of its activities was reached during the year 1907, when thousands of Russian Jews were fleeing from Pogrom cities and from a country torn by revolutionary strife, it might be inferred in some quarters that the Removal Office is designed to meet special situations such as pogroms with their consequent heavy stream of immigration to this country. It should be stated therefore at the outset that the Removal work has no such one-sided aspect. In its origin that may have been the immediate cause for its creation, but in its basic aspect it is constructive. In its essence and principles it is intended to act as a clearing house of Jewish immigration, to relieve, and to prevent, if possible, further congestion at the port of entry. The systematic distribution of the incoming masses of immigrants tends to make immigration healthy and desirable. There is enough room in this country for millions more inhabitants, provided they are fairly distributed and are not allowed to clog up any one particular point. By judicious distribution only the benefits of immigration will be felt and at the same time conditions in the port of entry will be greatly relieved. The immigrants who come to our shores do not elect New York as a stopping place for the sole reason that New York attracts them. But without discounting the importance of this influence in determining their destination, it is also a fact that since New York is the point of disembarking for the vast majority of ocean liners sailing from the European ports, it is more convenient for them from the point of view of expense and comforts, and so what was intended as



immigration to America becomes, to a considerable degree, immigration to New York. Distribution aims to make immigration to America a fact by giving every State in the Union its proportionate share. Distribution, however, is not only of benefit to the country at large, in which respect it would be of purely sociological or politico-economic value. It becomes philanthropic as well when it touches the individual immigrant in his person and gives him the opportunity to be tested fairly under conditions favorable to the working out of his economic salvation. Recognizing that his foreign tongue and his foreign culture are in themselves sufficient handicaps, distribution vouchsafes him at least a favorable environment where he may the sooner overcome the obstacles in his path. In this manner it logically evolves classes of immigrants who may be reasonably expected to become economically independent.

The work of distribution has a dual aspect as has already been suggested. On the one hand there is the individual man of flesh and blood, the applicant who comes with a request to be removed from New York. This applicant must be considered fully and fairly to obtain a correct understanding of his problem. To idealize him and to imagine him to be other than he is, would be fatal to every effort directed towards the successful handling of his case. He is a strange mixture, this applicant. On the one hand he is basically a product of Old World conditions with all that this implies. In his old habitat he was often spiritually and materially cramped. His development was hindered at every point. His latent and native ability was never allowed free and full play. Projected into New York by the exigencies of fate, his stay in the metropolis, if it has done anything, has tended to confuse him and to render him at odds with his environment. The transition from the simple and almost naive life in Russia to the complexities of New York has been too swift and sudden. Add to this that the complex economic system of which he finds himself an integral part, makes the pursuit of a livelihood more strenuous than it was in his old home and that this makes him readily receptive of the gospel of unrest and dissatisfaction preached to him at every turn, he is not the ideal material from which to choose pioneers who are to blaze the trail of a new life.

Exercising the greatest care in selection, employing a systematized apparatus of organization, the Industrial Removal Office has learned that even the best applicant is far from being a perfect specimen. Mistakes of judgment, therefore, are to be expected and should occasion no surprise. The best that can be hoped for is the elimination of the least desirable and to separate the wheat from the chaff, knowing well that the wheat at times may not be of the best quality. The ideal applicant would simplify distribution and this paper would not have to be written.

Considering the applicant in the aggregate, the discouraging aspect of the work vanishes. In the case of the aggregate an average can be struck and from experience the average is a reasonably high one. After all, 50,000 Jews have been removed, and granting that but 85% of these have remained at the places to which they were sent, something worth while has been accomplished. There is no method by which we can compute the number that these 50,000 have attracted without the aid of the Removal office or any other agency, but it must be considerable. A case in point is that of a certain city in Indiana, which ten years ago had a Jewish population of not more than thirty families all of German origin. Today, a conservative estimate places the number at one thousand. The Removal Office has not sent more than one-third of that number.

The work of directing this distribution with all the problems incidental thereto, belongs to the Removal Office. When the applicant is selected and sent off to his destination, he becomes the care of the receiving community. It is but natural, in view of the fact that the co-operating communities handle but comparatively few cases, that each case is received and viewed individually and that the larger aspect of the work is often lost sight of. And if the new arrival should give undue trouble and annoyance, as he often does, the receiving community not infrequently becomes discouraged, and at times expresses a disinclination to continue its co-operation. But the co-operating cities ought not to regard individual cases in the light of individual problems, but as a part of the great problem of distribution. Distribution must be attended with annoyance, trouble and disappointment, unless human nature be eliminated. We must not lose

sight of the character and make-up of the large mass of Jewish immigrants. We must not be afraid to admit that the Jewish immigrant is not unlike his fellowman, that he is an admixture of virtues and vices. For the creation of a good, sturdy class of citizens, however, the Jewish immigrant possesses every qualification. He is energetic, sober, conservative and ambitious, and therefore his presence in great numbers in this country cannot in any way be construed as derogatory to its best interests. Let his deficiencies be viewed frankly and tolerantly, bearing in mind that they are neither native nor yet deep-rooted, but are rather the effect of persecution. The problem therefore is to provide him with the proper environment where he may gradually develop his inherent virtues and ultimately work out his destiny. Let this work be carried on intelligently and sympathetically for a number of years and there will be created a class of Jewish artisans recruited from the Jewish immigrant class, which will prove not only a welcome addition to the Jewish communities of our land, but an important factor in the industrial life of the various cities throughout the country as well. That this is desirable, all will admit, and were we asked to suggest out of the diversity of our experience certain general rules to aid co-operating communities to achieve a fair measure of success in their work, we might offer the following for their guidance:

1. The arriving immigrant ought never to be regarded as a charity case in the same sense in which any local case of dependency is regarded, for without prejudice, at the very start the new-comer is neither delinquent nor deficient. By presumption he has not succeeded in New York, but for reasons beyond his control. The change in locale is supposed to remove the main disadvantage under which he has previously labored. His primary motive for leaving New York was to secure employment, and this is in substance what the Removal Office promised him. He should, therefore, be treated as a new-comer who has come to fill a definite place in the life of the community. The period of waiting for his job should not be prolonged, for in that period all the vexations crop out and it becomes a short step to consider him a problem, and when food and shelter during idleness are involved, a "charity" problem. As soon as this hap-

pens his satisfactory readjustment with his new environment is delayed. Effective co-operation which recognizes this danger, will seek to avoid it, not alone for the individual's sake, but in order to protect the community as well. The new-comer must never be made to feel that the question of his future has been taken out of his hands and has been assumed by a kindly disposed community.

2. The kind of a position to be secured for the new-comer is an important consideration. It will not do to settle the matter by placing him to work at anything which may be ready at hand. It must be borne in mind that the change in environment is supposed to benefit him. The sudden change of occupation will tend to nullify very largely the good results. This is just the trouble in New York which distribution aims to obviate, namely, that very often good mechanics in highly skilled trades are forced to accept employment in one of the needle trades, either as pressers or operators, because they cannot secure work at their respective trades. To duplicate this state of affairs in the new home would be fatal. The task that the receiving community should set before itself is, to provide the arriving mechanic as far as possible with work which will demand and make use of his fullest ability and skill, and for which he will receive at least a sum approximating his real earning powers. We realize that this end may not always be easily reached and not infrequently it is impossible to attain it for some time after his arrival, but there should be an earnest attempt in that direction. In sending workmen to the communities, the Industrial Removal Office has always tried to bear in mind the specific needs of the communities, the kind of factories and the character of labor most in demand. We realize that this policy on the part of the Removal Office has done much to smooth the way for the receiving community when the work of placing the man is before it.

3. When the workman has been placed to the best advantage at a job where he may reasonably be supposed to get along, the work is not necessarily complete. Thus far his physical self has been taken care of. If the interest in him stops at this point, the solution of his problem has not yet been reached. The Jew-

ish immigrant may be strongly individualistic but paradoxical as it may seem, he is just as strongly gregarious. He craves the society and companionship of his fellow-Jews. Where there is already a resident colony of Jews of the same East-European origin, the problem is a simple one and will work itself out. The newcomer will be attracted and absorbed by this element. To visit their synagogues, to join their lodges, to fall in with their mode of life will be a natural course. In the case of communities, however, in which there are few or no East-European Jews, great care must be exercised to make the stranger feel at home and to win him over gradually to the life of the community. As soon as he is made to feel that he is a man among men and a Jew among Jews, his problem ceases to be a problem. I appreciate that this result is more easily attained in words than in actual fact, and many are the pitfalls which must be avoided if this end is to be reached. The man may be sincerely religious or he may be indifferent to religious matters; in every case his honest convictions should be respected and treated tactfully. Above all, he must not be regarded with a patronizing air. His self-respect must not be injured, and if a number of these men are sent to any one city, it is inadvisable to herd them together and thereby to accentuate their distinctness as the Removal Office contingent or by any other convenient appellation. In short, each community must bring to the work of handling this problem of distribution, common sense, system and sympathy. They must all go hand in hand.

In sketching the foregoing *vade mecum* for the receiving communities, there is no implication intended that heretofore the communities co-operating with the Removal office have disregarded these rules and have handled the problem in haphazard manner. On the contrary, if it is at all possible to lay down any rules, it is because the communities themselves which have done the work most successfully in the past are those which have made it possible to formulate them. It may seem strange, however, that the receiving community is expected to achieve signal success with the material which we ourselves have admitted to be without defects. The qualification, however, must not be lost sight of, that the shortcomings are only the result of environment. For all prac-



tical purposes a very fair proportion of the mechanics who apply to the Removal Office are highly skilled. It is a far superior class in this respect to the class which emigrated from Russia in the 80's and early 90's. Since that time, Russia has undergone a great industrial development. In the wake of this development large factory towns have arisen. Improved machinery and improved methods are today the rule. The Jewish artisan of today coming from these towns is therefore much better qualified to handle American machinery, but it is not to be expected that he be as expert as the native American workingman. He will be slow at first and unused to American factory methods. His lack of the language must needs also prove a serious impediment. But speed, method and language may be acquired. The important need is, that the skilled mechanic be given the opportunity as quickly as possible to engage in his trade so that the period of adapting himself to American methods be gotten over with speedily. It is for the smaller cities and towns to supply the opportunity. This end in and of itself would make the work of the Removal Office highly desirable; but when in addition thereto the communities come to realize that distribution systematically carried out must needs prove of great value to the country at large, a double motive is supplied. Everyone is aware of the fact that the bulk of the general population is confined to certain definite and narrow sections of our country. Without referring to the prairie lands, government lands and deserts which must be developed along agricultural lines or are impossible of development, as the case may be, there are still vast states and sections of states abounding in cities and towns which have not yet reached the zenith of their industrial development, by reason of the fact that the population is sparse and that as a consequence there is a scarcity of labor. The problem, therefore, is to dove-tail the two needs; on the one hand the need of an outlet for the surplus population of the congested sections of the country—on the other hand, the need for additional population composed of a thrifty class of laborers on the part of the sparsely settled sections.

It may, perhaps, be argued that this is a rather broad platform for work which is, after all, limited in scope; that the fact



of scattering seven or eight thousand Jews a year over a broad land would hardly have an appreciable effect on any one section, but it is well to look ahead. The Jew in Russia is today no more immune from persecution and pogroms than he has been in the past, and he may again be made the scapegoat for the deficiencies of the Russian Bureaucracy. We do not desire to anticipate, and we fervently hope that any misgivings which we may have on this score may be groundless. But in the light of what has happened before, we should not ignore the lessons of the past. It is not impossible that events may transpire in Russia which would again send a stream of immigrants to the United States; outpourings of sympathy there will be in plenty as there have been in the past, but it will be more advantageous to all concerned if we be prepared to handle the unfortunate victims with intelligence and system. It is not advisable that three-fourths of any large number that may be driven here follow the example of their precursors and remain in the port of entry. It is preferable to perfect the machinery of distribution and by the strengthening of existing and by opening up new avenues of co-operation, to pave the way for an even and judicious distribution of the majority of them over the length and breadth of the land.

It would be futile to say that the work of distribution, as it has thus far been carried on by the Removal Office, has been sufficiently widespread to be considered equitable. While it is true that its beneficiaries have been sent to over eleven hundred cities and towns in the United States, the bulk of the Removal Office applicants have been sent to cities of the class to which Buffalo, Detroit, Cleveland, Pittsburg, Cincinnati and St. Louis belong. The result is that such cities have borne the brunt of the Industrial Removal Office distribution. Despite the fact that the Removal Office has rarely exceeded the number which these communities expressed their willingness and preparedness to accept, yet it cannot be denied that in proportion to the entire number distributed, these cities have done more than their fair share. Considering the work of distribution in the light of its ultimate object, namely, the creation of nuclei throughout the country which will attract to these points a fair proportion of the incoming immigrants, it would not be wise to make these cities

continue to absorb the bulk of the Removal Office applicants. To supplant the four or five ports of entry, to which the bulk of immigration is at present attracted, with thirty or even forty other cities of respectable size is a measureable improvement, but too slight in degree to serve as a comprehensive solution of the problem. But it should not be inferred from this that outside of the cities of the class which has been mentioned there has not been considerable distribution. Indeed, there are quite a number of smaller communities that have rendered splendid service. But in the main the co-operation accorded by the majority of the smaller cities and towns has been spasmodic at best. Various reasons have been offered in excuse for the inability or disinclination, as the case may be, to co-operate; sometimes, that employment was not available. As to this, it is a fact that instances have not been rare when at the time that co-operation had been refused for the aforementioned reason, requisitions have been received at the Removal Office directly from superintendents of shops and factories in those very towns. At other times, the excuse has been that disappointing experiences in the past with one of the Removal Office applicants rendered co-operation, in their opinion, ineffective. I have not the slightest doubt but that some of our beneficiaries, by their unreasonable conduct, have influenced well-intentioned communities to adopt this attitude. But they have lost sight of the fact that a big movement must not be judged in the light of their experience with isolated cases. The perfection of the work of distribution makes it imperative that the smaller communities offer a more extensive co-operation than heretofore. It would be highly desirable if it could be brought about that the larger cities be given, so to speak, a breathing spell, a period in which they could thoroughly assimilate all those who have been sent in the past and adjust all the little problems and details. This period of rest and adjustment would render these communities better fit to take care of future cases directed to them. This ideal arrangement will not be possible, however, until the smaller communities of the 25,000 to 75,000 population class do their full duty towards the movement.

The question is pertinent as to what kind of mechanics or workmen the Industrial Removal Office ought to send to co-operating cities. It would seem that the answer to this would not be difficult in view of the fact that among the beneficiaries of the Removal Office since its existence 221 different trades and callings are represented. Even more significant than this is the 1909 report of the Commissioner General of Immigration, in which he points out that among the Jewish immigrants of that year, every class of workingman was found with the single exception of shipwrights. But despite this, we are at times so restricted as to the kind of men that we are permitted to send, that it happens not infrequently that out of a roomful of otherwise eligible applicants, a very small number answer the specific demands from co-operating cities. If the expressed preferences of the receiving communities be taken into account, very little work could be accomplished. One community prefers married men with families, another prefers single men; one would like to have high class custom tailors during the busy season, forgetting that a high class custom tailor might find it convenient and profitable to stay in New York. An example of the mistaken notion of the idea of distribution is the case of the communal leader of a certain city writing to the Removal Office that his community felt the need of assisting in the worthy cause and that as a beginning they would accept a high class barber who could command a salary of \$20.00 a week and who is English-speaking. It did not occur to the gentleman's mind that a barber answering these requirements would hardly have need to apply to the Removal Office or any other distributing agency for assistance. If the wishes of some of the co-operating cities were to be taken into account, the applicants would have to be drafted from among the successful immigrants. This would not solve the immediate problem of the man who looks to distribution as his economic salvation. For this reason while it is possible to comply with the expressed preferences of the co-operating cities in respect to trades, size of families, married men or single men, to a certain extent, the distributing agency is forced by the circumstances pointed out to reserve for itself the right of final selection. Thus it will happen that the distributing points will

sometimes find themselves beset with problems which they ought to attack with the consciousness of the immensity of the problem as a whole and with the unselfish desire to contribute their small though important share in its solution.

Those who are engaged in the work of the Industrial Removal Office are fully aware that the sum total of 50,000 removed persons in a period of nine years is not a sum of intrinsic greatness when it is considered that there are at present 900,000 Jews in the metropolis; that the number continues to grow, and that twice 50,000 Jews may arrive at the Port of New York in any one year. They are also aware of the fact that with its present machinery of organization and with the limited funds at its disposal, the number of removals would hardly exceed 7,000 to 8,000 per annum. They feel, however, that the work of the Industrial Removal Office ought not to be regarded as an end but as a beginning. To handle an individual case successfully, to transplant a family into an environment favorable to its future well-being, to solve the every-day problem of food and shelter for the family, are in themselves highly important as viewed from the point of immediate relief. But the Removal Office aims to transcend the bounds of practical philanthropy and to propagate the idea of general distribution. It seeks to make distribution an automatic movement independent of any directing agency or institutional assistance. Its aim is to act as an invisible force to direct the stream of Jewish workingmen to our Western country, and it sets before itself the ideal that the time may come that of the Jews who land at Ellis Island in any one year, a majority of them will voluntarily and instantly depart for the interior upon their own initiative and without outside assistance.

This ideal, I dare hope, is not impossible of realization, provided a well-defined and ceaseless programme of propaganda be adopted and carried out. By reason of its experience and its unique position, the Removal Office ought itself to act as the fountain-head of these propaganda. Not only will it serve as the experimental laboratory, but also as the directive and impelling force to give impetus to the movement, taking it out of the experimental stage. To enable the Removal Office to perform this work, it will be necessary that this organization be strengthened

and perfected in its every department. Those who are in charge of the work and who have grown up with it, are directing their best energies to improved method. Their work will be futile, however, unless it is reinforced by the more intensive and extensive co-operation of the entire country.

Thus far, distribution has been discussed with New York and other Atlantic Coast Ports as important factors. The problem, briefly stated, was the handling of the large masses of Jewish immigrants congested in these cities. A radical departure from this view of the problem is presented by what has come to be popularly known as the "Galveston" Movement.

#### THE GALVESTON MOVEMENT.

This movement, inaugurated and supported by the generosity of Mr. Jacob H. Schiff, for diverting Jewish immigration from the Eastern seaboard towns to the territory west of the Mississippi River with Galveston as the Port of Entry, is the first deliberate effort in America to divert the Jewish immigrant from the Atlantic Port cities. It is the attempt to divert the current from those few places where it has come to a head, and where the height of the tide is creating problems of great import to American Jewry. Discounting the exaggerations of the muck-raking magazines which contrive to find every ill, real and imaginary, in New York's crowded Jewish quarter, the very fact that the peculiar conditions to be found in that quarter make it a fertile field for magazine exploitation to the discredit of American Jewry, ought to be of vital concern to those who desire that the settlement of Jews in this country be normal and not involved with any vexing problems. To summarize the Jewish immigration of the last seventy years which practically covers the important periods of Jewish immigration, is to rehearse an oft-repeated story. It has its place here, however, for it will help in securing the proper perspective towards the Jewish Immigrants' Information Bureau, the name under which the Galveston movement is carried on.

Jewish immigration in America falls under two classifications, the Western European and the Eastern European. The Western, or what has come to be regarded as the German, dates back



to the early 40's of the last century, and began with the pioneers who fled the German petty kingdoms, which by persecution and despotism drove the first notable body of Jewish immigrants to America. Here they worked their way to success upon unbeaten mercantile paths. This was followed by a larger contingent when the German Revolution of 1848 was suppressed. Within three decades this element had become assimilated, for America was in the building, and the thrifty immigrant of that epoch fitted easily into the material and spiritual conditions of his adopted country and made the most of them.

The Eastern European immigration with its source in Russia, Roumania, Galicia and Hungary, is of greater issue. In comparison with its yearly drift of nearly 100,000, the German accession will shortly pale into insignificance. This stream empties into the strip of territory which borders the Atlantic Coast; and except for the overflow into the large inland cities of Chicago, St. Louis, Cincinnati and Cleveland, and the dribble into the Pacific port towns, it is at points contiguous to the Atlantic Coast that the volume remains. New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore and Boston absorb the greater part of this new influx. So that while the center of population in the United States is moving Westward and may soon tilt Southwestward, what may be considered the Jewish center of population has not followed this normal shift.

Although the cost of transportation and the social attraction of large centers have contributed in retarding the drift Westward, the uncertainty regarding the material advantages in the small town has been a large factor in determining whither the mass of immigrants will gravitate. If this holds good for the section east of the Mississippi, how much more unattractive, even repelling, must the Hinterland appear, which is a veritable land of mystery both to the recent new-comer and the intending emigrant from Eastern Europe.

The port of Galveston invited entry; but to take the plunge into the Hinterland where Yiddish may be an unknown tongue, *kosher* food an unknown thing, and labor opportunities limited, was left only to the most daring. Those who might have previously penetrated this far Western section and have won ma-



terial success, could hardly prove lode-stones; for daring as the Russian is in his philosophy, he is conservative in action; he could make his wants known in his own language in New York and other Eastern cities; and if his wants were dire, his friends and fellow-countrymen were ready to lend a helping hand. The West, on the other hand, loomed chill. No Yiddish news emanated from it that could influence the East-Sider of New York or reach across the sea. The very names of these cities were almost as unknown in New York as in the Pale. As a result, the Russian immigrant regarded the Hinterland with the same feeling that a child might regard a dark room.

To carry the parallel further, how could this dark interior be lighted up so that the frightened child might walk into it with confidence? The answer to this question was the creation of the Galveston movement, organized with the purpose of popularizing the West and Southwest as objective points for Jewish immigration. The opportunities in what is as yet an undeveloped field present an array of facts, bearing out the contention, that the immigrant, in throwing in his destiny with the newer sections of the United States will reap the benefits of a growing country where the struggle for a livelihood is not so intense, and where the environment is more favorable.

On his arrival at Galveston the immigrant comes under the direction of an institution which has literally paved the way for him. The Jewish Immigrants' Information Bureau in creating committees in all of the growing towns of the West and Southwest, deliberately seeks to make the immigrants' beginning easier. It sees to it that with the aid of the local committees the immigrant is properly cared for until work is obtained for him and that he is accorded that friendship and sympathy which are so essential to the spiritual well-being of the stranger. In this way every incentive is given him to accommodate himself to the new conditions of life which he encounters.

It is a tender shoot which the Bureau is nursing into life. If the spirit of supervision appears over-scrupulous and over-helpful, it must be borne in mind that the Bureau is not intent upon perpetuating its own existence. It is bent upon another mission entirely. It hopes to divert from the Eastern ports a sufficiently

large number of Jewish immigrants to the West and Southwest who will eventually become centers of attraction in themselves, and who will make of the Hinterland a reality and rob it of its isolation and uncertainty.

Even were the Galveston movement to be regarded as an experiment (which will hardly be borne out by its record of nearly 2,000 immigrants distributed through that Port despite the industrial panic that came on the heels of its formation), the conditions favoring its success are natural ones and not the result of an artificial stimulus. In the first place there is the demand for labor in the West and Southwest arising from the development of these sections. The entrance of Russian Jewish labor into these parts is not an invasion but a necessary addition to the industrial growth of a dozen states. It is a notable fact, for instance, that immigrants coming through the Bureau are finding work in railroad shops, and even more significant than this is the fact that in quite a number of instances co-operating agencies have been able to find employment for the newly arrived immigrants at their own trades on the very same day of their arrival in the city to which they were sent by the Bureau.

Secondly, the pioneer German Jews in the states that may be conveniently termed "Bureau Territory" have on the whole not been backward in accepting the Galveston movement as an essentially sound one; while the Russian Jewish element which had already won a foothold in this section, has entered into the work most sympathetically.

Thirdly, it has been noticed that the effect of the movement has been to infuse something akin to the pioneer spirit into the immigrant. That some of the immigrants should feel the lure of the Eastern cities and should drift there at the first opportunity is hardly surprising. A secondary drift takes place from the town in which the immigrant has been placed to the next larger town within striking distance, and there the initial impulse appears to exhaust itself. But a noteworthy feature is the frequent drift towards the smaller communities within easy reach.

Fourthly, the fact that employment is found for the immigrant on his arrival at his destination, serves as the prime factor in making the immigrant a fixture. To secure a livelihood is his

elemental need. Other factors being fairly satisfactory (the proximity of other Russians, *kosher* food, religious services) this one determines his status as a permanent dweller in the community.

Fifthly, where the success of the movement two decades ago might have been jeopardized by the very high percentage of unskilled labor which must necessarily have come, today, as already stated before, the industrial development of Russia and its trend towards modernity in method and production, is developing an artisan who, aside of the handicap of a different form of speech, compares much more favorably with the American artisan than was the case a decade or two ago. The Bureau has reports from several co-operating communities of skilled workers who earn over \$20.00 a week.

Therefore, for the reasons above outlined, the Galveston movement, which has for its object the systematic direction and distribution of the Jewish immigration which will come to this country in the natural course of events, should be welcomed and regarded sympathetically by all. The Galveston movement if carefully nurtured has in it the possibilities of becoming one of the most effective means of solving the problem of even distribution.

If at present the Bureau's activities are limited, it must not be forgotten that it is laboring under certain disadvantages and handicaps not within its control. First and foremost is the existing and wide-spread prejudice in favor of New York as a landing place. It will take many years before it can be hoped to remove this. Furthermore, the competition between Galveston and New York is an unfair one. Granted that Galveston can convince the intending immigrant that it is for his best welfare that he elect to enter America via that port, the fact still remains that Galveston does not as yet hold out to him the allurements of swift ocean greyhounds upon which he can travel in comparative comfort even in the despised steerage. In short, Galveston does not offer adequate transportation facilities. Only one steamship line from Europe makes the port regularly, and then only once in three weeks, and because of the absence of competition the trip is very long and tedious and the steamers inferior to those crossing to New York.

The removal of these physical disadvantages will prove important factors in making Galveston more popular.

Then again, the ignorance of the immigrant of American geography in general and of Galveston in particular, will have to be counteracted by a well-defined programme of propaganda. The fixed idea in the minds of most intending immigrants that New York and America are synonymous, must be up-rooted by a campaign of enlightenment. In fact the entire distribution movement can be advanced through every dignified and legitimate means of publicity. The Industrial Removal Office has already adopted this method of propaganda in the form of press articles on conditions in the West, and pamphlets which have been distributed in the Jewish districts. This form of propaganda admits of further development, however. The Industrial Removal Office contemplates shortly to publish and to scatter a series of leaflets, descriptive of the industrial, social, religious and educational life of about two hundred and fifty cities and towns of the country. It is not intended thereby to encourage applicants, and therefore no specific mention of the Industrial Removal Office will be made in these leaflets. They are to serve as a means of educating the Jew of New York in American life and conditions, and to create in him a healthy desire, a pioneer spirit, to go forth and make his way in a new land. For new land it is indeed to him, who, in New York, is, to say the most, but geographically and not spiritually removed from his old European environment. Once this desire is created, the budding pioneer will find the way either with or without the assistance of the Industrial Removal Office. If without, so much the better. To supplement the work of press and pamphlet publicity, the illustrated lecture can be employed to good advantage. A beginning has already been made in that direction with an appreciable result. A remarkable feature of these lectures was the impression made on the audience when the map of the United States was thrown on the screen, and when many began to comprehend for the first time the immensity of our country in extent of territory.

Transportation facilities have contributed largely to the growth and development of every new settlement. But to aid in any movement which has for its object the emigration of large bodies

of people from the crowded sections to the as yet sparsely settled but promising territory, it is not sufficient that the person desiring to go westward merely have the choice of three or four or even five transportation lines. From New York to California, Washington, Oregon or even Colorado and Iowa the cost of transportation is the greatest obstacle and almost prohibitive to that class of pioneers who have the brain and the brawn so necessary to the development of the newer sections of our country. The railroad companies would do well to recognize the commercial value of a steady stream of immigration to the undeveloped sections through which their roads run. They might well foresee that an augmented western population will mean a larger productivity for that region, with the resultant increase in the freight and passenger business. A reduction in the rate of transportation would not only facilitate the work of the distributing of immigrants, but it would also enable workingmen of moderate means, who, by reason of their longer stay in this country, have acquired the language and have absorbed the spirit of American institutions, to take advantage of the improved opportunities which the West affords them. A movement westward on the part of such workingmen in large numbers would be of inestimable benefit to those sections of the country where an intelligent class of artisans is in great demand to aid in the development of industries and in the growth of trade and commerce. I venture to say that it would pay the railroads as a business proposition to offer a largely reduced rate of transportation, at least to points in the far West and Southwest, to which the present cost of transportation is a most serious drawback to an undoubtedly considerable number of sincere and earnest men and women who desire to throw in their lot with those newer sections of our country, whose praise they have heard sung for so long and whose opportunities they have seen described in glowing terms in both press and magazines. There are many who would undoubtedly be influenced to give their all to the land that beckons to them with hope and promise, and who, because of the prohibitive cost of transportation, must abandon their cherished dreams and must remain behind and accept the inevitable conclusion that the far West for them is but a visionary and impossible project.



I do not for a moment lose sight of the many difficulties which the adoption of such a scheme presents, nor am I unmindful of the fact that new legislation might have to be enacted to overcome certain present legal obstacles to the plan suggested. At all events the suggestions here thrown out are, in my humble opinion, worthy of consideration and thought, and even though they may be rejected as impracticable and impossible of accomplishment, yet it may be that as a result and out of the wisdom and far-sightedness of those who preside over the destinies of our transportation enterprises, the seed will be sown which will develop a more extensive and practical co-operation on the part of the railroads in the big problem of distribution of population.

The basis of all industrial life is the soil, and, if distribution of immigration is to be comprehensive, too much importance cannot be attached to any movement which seeks to attract the Jewish immigrant to the farm. While it is true that the pursuit of agriculture has been denied to the Jew by the governments of those countries in which he is to be found in the largest numbers, yet it is a fact that there are many immigrant Jews who come from Russian and Galician farm villages who are, by nature and instinct, adapted to farm life even though they are not especially adept in farm work. They may not be farmers, and the disappointments which Jewish societies for the encouragement of agriculture among Jews in this country have experienced in their highly laudable work, may be many. But it has been proven beyond a doubt, that to a reasonable extent, and with careful training and supervision during the initial period of their, so to speak, apprenticeship in farm work, they possess the material from which farmers can be made. Indeed, many government homesteads have been settled by sturdy Jewish farmers, and these farms have not only afforded a profitable living, but have contributed to the wealth and prosperity of the nation. From statistics, which are necessarily incomplete, we learn that there are listed on the books of the Jewish Agricultural and Industrial Aid Society alone over 3,000 farmers in this country, representing 15,000 souls, occupying over 2,700 farms. These figures probably do not represent more than 50 per cent. of the actual total number of Jewish farmers in this country. Here, again, it is well to remember that the Jew



is not unlike his fellowman. He, too, feels the lure of the city, and in this age, when many of our farms are being abandoned by families who for generations have lived on the soil and who are being drawn irresistibly to the large cities, it is not at all remarkable that it is difficult to attract those who have been accustomed to urban life, to rural occupations. But, perhaps, just because of this, namely, the fact that he has been forced to city life for so many generations, his reluctance to take up farming as a means of livelihood should be viewed tolerantly. But I would urge, as I have upon previous occasions, that every effort be made to instill in the children of our people a love for the soil when they are still in the period of training, and when agricultural education will do much to influence their future avocation. Even here the natural preferences of the American youth must be reckoned with, and in the light of this it would be idle to say that Jewish farming can ever assume a dominant place in the large work of distribution. Even the most ardent exponents of the idea of agriculture do not claim this for it, but if by reason of increased activities the number of farmers be increased perceptibly, a valuable contribution will be made to the solution of the problem of Jewish distribution.

Our country is destined in the course of years to absorb millions of immigrants from European lands. The drift to America will persist as long as America spells opportunity, and there is a surplus of population in the old world. Among these millions there will be many of our co-religionists, even though persecution will cease to be a special reason for Jewish immigration. It would be a short-sighted policy that would counsel that we do not look beyond the immediate problems at hand, but a wise statesmanship will lead us to look beyond the present, that we prepare for the future, so that our successors of the generations to come will be able to meet the problem of Jewish immigration with intelligence, with discretion and with zeal, and, above all, with the heritage of our experience.

## Resume of Work of the Industrial Removal Office, 1901-1909.

Showing the Distribution of 45,711 Persons in 1,278 Cities and Towns in the United States and Canada, also giving the Total Number of Persons Sent to Each State, and the Total Number of Cities Covered in Each State.

States.	Cities.	1901	1902	1903	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	Totals.
Alabama.....	35	52	37	47	88	115	136	88	88	19	670
Arizona.....	7	...	1	1	2	3	11	7	1	...	26
Arkansas.....	16	66	14	9	8	34	28	20	6	...	185
California.....	32	36	67	260	429	233	403	369	323	294	2,414
Colorado.....	37	104	218	214	189	216	380	383	283	141	2,128
Connecticut.....	24	23	67	139	15	26	12	1	27	10	320
Delaware.....	5	...	2	...	5	...	1	2	2	2	14
Dist. of Columbia.	1	5	1	...	...	2	9	11	7	1	36
Florida.....	7	17	23	38	29	24	14	22	52	24	243
Georgia.....	22	15	32	45	65	114	103	115	133	59	681
Idaho.....	1	...	...	1	3	1	...	4	...	...	9
Illinois.....	67	131	302	412	528	640	585	588	612	489	4,287
Indiana.....	35	100	166	183	188	234	259	315	184	113	1,742
Iowa.....	52	18	76	113	157	96	147	200	177	68	1,052
Kansas.....	37	42	66	39	36	28	36	38	42	22	349
Kentucky.....	17	46	32	33	84	98	137	110	89	57	686
Louisiana.....	17	29	107	69	53	75	45	57	66	10	511
Maine.....	14	...	...	9	5	7	8	5	19	2	55
Maryland.....	12	9	6	13	53	53	31	32	23	6	226
Massachusetts.....	19	5	9	122	81	42	40	18	22	18	357
Michigan.....	50	104	75	162	187	239	290	450	180	191	1,878
Minnesota.....	28	58	79	147	211	235	248	308	227	163	1,676
Mississippi.....	37	35	41	17	28	40	95	20	13	7	296
Missouri.....	39	73	300	765	980	608	620	671	426	370	4,813
Montana.....	7	1	7	11	5	4	6	...	21	6	61
Nebraska.....	18	15	105	326	184	180	263	366	209	84	1,732
Nevada.....	2	...	...	...	...	1	5	...	...	...	6
New Hampshire.....	6	...	1	...	1	...	3	6	2	...	13
New Jersey.....	19	151	85	112	121	91	102	123	75	18	878
New Mexico.....	11	4	25	...	1	...	5	11	1	2	49
New York.....	107	20	90	240	479	454	425	475	238	247	2,668
North Carolina.....	12	...	2	7	1	9	9	4	18	14	64
North Dakota.....	30	5	6	33	22	18	79	95	84	28	370
Ohio.....	64	152	350	726	622	765	1,020	1,065	352	419	5,477
Oklahoma.....	32	12	44	4	35	6	20	24	15	7	161
Oregon.....	3	11	30	19	53	51	117	110	55	100	546
Pennsylvania.....	101	155	265	346	225	362	362	375	194	83	2,367
Rhode Island.....	1	...	1	2	21	1	...	...	6	3	34
South Carolina.....	17	3	7	...	4	21	8	19	56	11	129
South Dakota.....	9	7	8	1	6	9	2	5	19	7	64
Tennessee.....	16	72	26	45	92	152	192	136	91	43	849
Texas.....	45	113	121	121	110	149	89	83	121	60	967
Utah.....	5	...	1	1	13	10	5	8	5	12	55
Vermont.....	11	...	17	...	8	7	11	5	11	...	59
Virginia.....	13	32	10	11	16	41	35	21	36	30	232
Washington.....	7	10	8	9	21	27	64	127	52	123	441
West Virginia.....	19	42	32	22	8	16	3	11	16	14	164
Wisconsin.....	56	35	207	482	364	314	274	371	201	112	2,360
Wyoming.....	3	...	4	...	1	4	...	4	...	2	15
Canada.....	53	22	35	169	186	150	185	308	228	13	1,296
<b>Grand Totals</b>	<b>1,278</b>	<b>1,830</b>	<b>3,208</b>	<b>5,525</b>	<b>6,023</b>	<b>6,005</b>	<b>6,922</b>	<b>7,586</b>	<b>5,103</b>	<b>3,504</b>	<b>45,711</b>

Total number distributed by the Philadelphia Branch during a period of 9 years..... 2,459  
 Total number distributed by the Boston Branch during a period of 6 years..... 2,068

Total number distributed by the I. R. O. and its branches..... 50,238

Showing the Occupations of 24,123 Wage Earners Distributed During a Period of 8 Years (1902-9), Representing 221 Occupations and Divided According to Groups, Manufacturing and Non-Manufacturing.

MANUFACTURING	
WOODWORKING—Per Cent. 9.97	
Cabinet-makers .....	289
Carpenters.....	1,822
Carriage Painters.....	4
Carriage Trimmers.....	3
Coach Striper.....	1
Coopers.....	97
Varnishers and Polishers.....	22
Veneer-workers.....	1
Wheelwrights.....	13
Wagon-makers.....	9
Wood-carvers.....	56
Wood-turners.....	87
<hr/>	
Total.....	2,404

METAL WORKING—	
Per Cent. 9.17	
Iron, Brass and Copper Workers.....	645
Blacksmiths.....	514
Boiler-makers.....	12
Brass Polishers.....	5
Dynamo-workers.....	1
Engineers.....	10
Horse Shoer.....	1
Machinist.....	322
Metal Cutters.....	1
Metal Platers.....	1
Metal Polishers.....	8
Metal Spinners.....	1
Molders.....	4
Potters.....	2
TinSmiths and Roofers.....	685
<hr/>	
Total.....	2,212

BUILDING—Per Cent. 8.03	
Bricklayers.....	135
Framers.....	4
Gas Fitters.....	2
Glaziers.....	68

Lathers.....	6
Locksmiths.....	440
Marble Polishers.....	2
Marble-workers.....	1
Masons and Plasterers.....	73
Painters and Paperhangers...	1,033
Plumbers.....	161
Shinglers.....	6
Stone Cutters.....	4
Tile-layers.....	1
Tilemakers.....	1
<hr/>	
Total.....	1,937

PRINTING & LITHOGRAPHY—	
Per Cent. .93	
Bookbinders.....	116
Compositors.....	13
Electro Platers.....	1
Engravers.....	1
Feeders.....	7
Lithographers.....	5
Printers.....	83
<hr/>	
Total.....	226

LEATHER—Per Cent. 6.99	
Assembler.....	1
Dress Suit Case-maker.....	8
Harness-maker.....	147
Lasters.....	6
Leather-workers.....	10
Pocketbook-makers.....	26
Pocketbook-cutters.....	7
Saddle-makers.....	1
Shoe Cutters.....	6
Shoe Finishers.....	2
Shoe Fitters.....	5
Shoemakers and Repairers ...	1,105
Shoe Operators.....	3
Tanners.....	331
Upper-makers.....	29
<hr/>	
Total.....	1,687

NEEDLE INDUSTRIES, CLOTHING and MILLINERY SUPPLIES, ETC.—Per Cent. 20.86

Bed-robe-makers.....	1
Beltmakers.....	1
Buttonhole-makers.....	22
Button-makers.....	10
Cap Blocker.....	1
Cap Cutter.....	2
Cap Finisher.....	5
Capmakers.....	56
Corset-makers.....	2
Collar-makers.....	1
Cutters.....	56
Dressmakers.....	91
Embroiderers.....	11
Feather-workers.....	1
Finishers (men's clothing)....	134
Flower-makers.....	7
Fur Dyer.....	1
Furriers.....	127
Fur Nailer.....	1
Glovemakers.....	6
Hat Finisher.....	1
Hatmakers.....	7
Hat-band-maker.....	1
Hemstitcher.....	1
Knitters.....	11
Lacemakers.....	1
Mantle-makers.....	1
Milliners.....	25
Neck-tie-makers.....	1
Operators (men's clothing) ...	1,456
Overall-makers.....	2
Passementerie-workers.....	6
Pattern-makers.....	1
Pleaters.....	12
Pressers.....	564
Shirt-cutters.....	1
Shirt-folders.....	2
Shirtmakers.....	96
Shirt-pressers.....	3
Suspender-makers.....	7
Shirt Examiner.....	1
Tailors:	
Ladies Tailors, Bushelmen, Helpers, Basters, etc.....	2,129
Tucker.....	1

Waistmakers.....	31
Waist-trimmers.....	1
Weavers.....	116
Wire Framers.....	14
Wrapper-makers.....	2
Total.....	5,030

TOBACCO—Per Cent. .77

Cigar-makers.....	136
Cigarette-makers.....	49
Strippers.....	1
Total.....	186

MISCELLANEOUS—Per Cent. 1.95

Album-makers.....	1
Bed-spring-makers.....	1
Bristle-workers.....	2
Brushmakers.....	31
Candle-makers.....	6
Chair Caners.....	1
Combmakers.....	2
Comb Setters.....	1
Cork-workers.....	1
Diamond Setters.....	1
Frame Gilders.....	3
Goldsmiths.....	6
Jewelers.....	27
Jewelry-box-makers.....	2
Mattress-makers.....	11
Paper-box-makers.....	24
Parquet-layers.....	1
Picture-frame-makers.....	4
Ropemakers.....	2
Sign Painter.....	1
Silversmiths.....	5
Smoking Pipe Polisher.....	1
Soapmakers.....	4
Trunkmakers.....	64
Umbrella-makers.....	2
Umbrella-stick-makers.....	1
Upholsterers.....	152
Watchmakers.....	109
Wigmakers.....	2
Watchcase-maker.....	1
Total.....	469

MEN WITHOUT TRADES—  
Per Cent. 31.65

Unskilled laborers.....	7,328
Peddlers.....	309
Total.....	7,637

FARMING—Per Cent. 1.74

Farmers.....	419
--------------	-----

SMALL DEALERS IN FOOD  
STUFFS—Per Cent. 3.36

Bakers.....	308
Brewers.....	2
Butchers.....	455
Confectioners.....	8
Distillers.....	10
Egg Candles.....	7
Fishermen.....	2
Fruit Packers.....	1
Ice Cream Wafer-makers.....	1
Millers.....	12
Syrup-makers.....	1
Wurstmakers.....	2
Total.....	809

OFFICE HELP PROFESSIONALS,  
ETC.—Per Cent. 3.06

Architects.....	1
Artists.....	2
Bookkeepers.....	25
Cantors.....	4
Chemists.....	4
Chiroprudists.....	1
Civil Engineers.....	2
Clerks.....	375
Dentists.....	5
Designers.....	2
Draftsmen.....	10
Druggists.....	26
Electricians.....	91
Gardeners.....	1
Hebrew Teachers.....	62

Journalists.....	3
Mechanics.....	1
Mechanical Dentists.....	4
Mechanical Engineers.....	1
Midwives.....	2
Musicians.....	16
Nurses.....	7
Opticians.....	2
Physicians.....	2
Photographers.....	27
Pianists.....	1
Reporters.....	1
Sculptors.....	2
Schochetim.....	50
Stenographers.....	6
Telegrapher.....	1
Telephone Operator.....	1
Total.....	738

NON-MANUFACTURING

MISCELLANEOUS—Per Cent. 1.52

Barbers.....	111
Bartenders.....	1
Bottlers.....	1
Canvassers.....	1
Cleaners and Dyers.....	10
Cooks.....	5
Domestics.....	18
Firemen.....	2
Florists.....	2
Junk Sorters.....	2
Junk Dealers.....	2
Laundrymen and women.....	11
Miners.....	2
Motorman.....	1
Packers.....	8
Porters.....	23
Salesmen and women.....	33
Stationers.....	1
Waiters.....	38
Wagon Drivers.....	94
Window-cleaners.....	1
Window-dressers.....	2
Total.....	369

## Being a Summary of Nine Years' Work of the Removal Office and Its Branches in Philadelphia and Boston.

Year.	Families removed with head.	Families removed to join head.	Married men whose families remained in New York.	Married men with families in Europe.	Unmarried men (All wage-earners.)
1901	89	104	179	269	628
1902	118	237	249	545	1,053
1903	345	346	318	983	1,328
1904	327	400	222	2,081	1,082
1905	374	406	144	1,706	1,354
1906	604	423	167	1,264	1,628
1907	635	424	243	1,369	2,178
1908	451	428	202	511	1,195
1909	321	311	96	292	689
Total.	3,264	3,079	1,820	9,020	11,135

Families removed with head..... 3,264

Families removed to join head..... 3,079

Total number of families removed..... 6,343

Number of individuals represented by above..... 23,736

Married men with families remaining in New York or in

Europe..... 10,840

Unmarried men..... 11,135

Total number of individuals..... 45,711

Of these there were adult wage-earners..... 25,239

Total number distributed by I. R. O. during a period of 9 years..... 45,711

Total number distributed by the Philadelphia Branch..... 2,459

Total number distributed by the Boston Branch..... 2,068

Grand Total..... 50,238



## Report of Jewish Immigrants' Information Bureau from June 10th, 1907, to March 10th, 1910.

### DISTRIBUTION BY STATES.

Arizona.....	3
Texas.....	342
Missouri.....	247
Iowa.....	224
Minnesota.....	172
Colorado.....	93
Louisiana.....	57
Nebraska.....	87
Kansas.....	62
Tennessee.....	45
Arkansas.....	48
Illinois.....	27
Oklahoma.....	42
Mississippi.....	15
California.....	30
North Dakota.....	14
Georgia.....	12
Oregon.....	6
Washington.....	6
Wisconsin.....	6
Connecticut.....	5
Kentucky.....	5
Utah.....	3
Ohio.....	1
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>1,552</b>

### DISTRIBUTION BY CITIES.

#### MISSOURI.

Carthage.....	1
Hannibal.....	7
Joplin.....	9
Kansas City.....	143
Moberly.....	5
St. Joseph.....	54
St. Louis.....	25
Webb City.....	1
Sedalia.....	2
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>247</b>

### TEXAS.

Beaumont.....	7
Brenham.....	1
Corsicana.....	1
Dallas.....	67
El Paso.....	5
Fort Worth.....	56
Gainesville.....	6
Galveston.....	26
Houston.....	37
Marshall.....	5
Palestine.....	10
San Antonio.....	46
Texarkana.....	16
Tyler.....	18
Taylor.....	1
Waco.....	40
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>342</b>

#### IOWA.

Burlington.....	17
Cedar Rapids.....	16
Chariton.....	1
Clinton.....	3
Council Bluff.....	17
Davenport.....	31
Des Moines.....	64
Dubuque.....	26
Fort Dodge.....	6
Muscatine.....	3
Sioux City.....	11
Ottumwa.....	29
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>224</b>

#### MINNESOTA.

Chisholm.....	2
Duluth.....	25
Eveleth.....	3
Hibbing.....	1
Minneapolis.....	100
St. Paul.....	39
Virginia.....	1
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>171</b>

TENNESSEE.

Memphis.....	40
Nashville.....	5
Total.....	45

COLORADO.

Boulder.....	5
Colorado Springs.....	20
Denver.....	35
Pueblo.....	31
Trinidad.....	2
Total.....	93

LOUISIANA.

Alexandria.....	1
Baton Rouge.....	3
Lake Charles.....	2
Lafayette.....	3
New Orleans.....	48
Total.....	57

NEBRASKA.

Grand Island.....	3
Hastings.....	4
Lincoln.....	45
Omaha.....	36
Total.....	88

KANSAS.

Atchison.....	3
Fort Scott.....	3
Galena.....	1
Hutchinson.....	5
Iola.....	1
Independence.....	2
Leavenworth.....	24
Pittsburg.....	3
Topeka.....	12
Wichita.....	7
Total.....	61

ARKANSAS.

Fort Smith.....	8
Little Rock.....	23
Pine Bluff.....	16
Total.....	47

ILLINOIS.

Quincy.....	13
Rock Island.....	14
Total.....	27

MISSISSIPPI.

Natchez.....	6
Vicksburg.....	9
Total.....	15

OKLAHOMA.

Ardmore.....	5
Chickasha.....	1
El Reno.....	1
Guthrie.....	4
Lawton.....	2
McAlester.....	2
Oklahoma City.....	25
Shawnee.....	1
Tulsa.....	1
Total.....	42

NORTH DAKOTA.

Ashley.....	11
Fargo.....	3
Total.....	14

CALIFORNIA.

Los Angeles.....	22
San Francisco.....	8
Total.....	30

GEORGIA.

Atlanta.....	12
	<hr/>
Total.....	12

OREGON.

Portland.....	6
	<hr/>
Total.....	6

WISCONSIN.

Milwaukee.....	4
Superior.....	2
	<hr/>
Total.....	6

CONNECTICUT.

Bridgeport.....	4
Hartford.....	1
	<hr/>
Total.....	5

ARIZONA.

Douglass.....	1
Tucson.....	2
	<hr/>
Total.....	3

WASHINGTON.

Seattle.....	6
	<hr/>
Total.....	6

KENTUCKY.

Louisville.....	5
	<hr/>
Total.....	5

UTAH.

Salt Lake City.....	3
	<hr/>
Total.....	3

OHIO.

Cleveland.....	1
	<hr/>
Total.....	1

**Occupations of Immigrants Handled by the Jewish Immigrants'  
Information Bureau of Galveston, Texas.**

**86 OCCUPATIONS REPRESENTED.**

Shoemakers.....	122	Sashmakers.....	2
Tailors.....	103	Shirtmakers.....	3
Carpenters.....	68	Upper-makers.....	3
Blacksmiths.....	36	Soda-water-makers.....	2
Tinsmiths.....	35	Clerks.....	2
Butchers.....	35	Paperhangers.....	2
Locksmiths.....	35	Smelter.....	1
Cabinetmakers.....	26	Teacher.....	1
Dressmakers.....	25	Salesman.....	1
Bakers.....	21	Horse Shoer.....	1
Painters.....	21	Button-makers.....	1
Tanners.....	23	Buttonhole-makers.....	1
Weavers.....	19	Baby-carriage-makers.....	1
Farmers.....	16	Boxmakers.....	1
Watchmakers.....	15	Cooks.....	1
Bookbinders.....	13	Cutters.....	1
Capmakers.....	10	Coppersmiths.....	1
Cigarette-makers.....	10	Decorators.....	1
Leather-workers.....	10	Dentists.....	1
Soapmakers.....	8	Druggists.....	1
Millers.....	8	Engravers.....	1
Ironworkers.....	8	Iron-bedmakers.....	1
Pressers.....	8	Macaroni-makers.....	1
Barbers.....	8	Motormen.....	1
Electricians.....	6	Plumbers.....	1
Wood-turners.....	5	Ropemakers.....	1
Printers.....	5	Sausage-makers.....	1
Confectioners.....	6	Stenographers.....	1
Brushmakers.....	6	Sewing-machine-repairers.....	1
Glaziers.....	6	Trimmers.....	1
Harness-makers.....	6	Wagon-makers.....	1
Coopers.....	6	Glovemakers.....	1
Furriers.....	5	Capmakers.....	1
Machinists.....	4	Egg Packers.....	1
Stonecutters.....	5	Boiler-makers.....	1
Wheelwrights.....	5	Shingler.....	1
Upholsterers.....	4	Drivers.....	1
Brewers.....	3	Dyers.....	1
Chairmakers.....	3	Goldsmith.....	1
Bookkeepers.....	3		
Bricklayers.....	3	Persons representing 86 occu- pations.....	825
Embroiderers.....	2	Without Occupations.....	432
Gardeners.....	3	Women and Children.....	296
Hatters.....	3		
Milliners.....	2		
Roofers.....	2	Grand Total.....	1,553
Stone-engravers.....	2		

## DISCUSSION.

By JONAS WEIL,  
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

I am called a little out of the regular order, but still I trust that I shall be able to give you the experience of the Removal Office from the receiving standpoint.

It is with a great deal of fear and trepidation that I shall attempt to discuss a paper so comprehensive, a report by a man who has had the experience in this work that Mr. Bressler has had. He has told us that for the past nine years he has been engaged in that work and he has studied every angle of the question.

There are two sides to that question. We know that work of administration is necessary, and we know and admit the necessity of removal work; that is elemental. We see in removal work one of the great arguments against the anti-immigrationists.

To discuss this paper and point out criticisms or faults in a paper by a man who has made a life study of this work is indeed a difficult task, so I will not attempt to supplement that part of the paper which deals with the work from the New York standpoint. However, when a question of this kind reduces itself, when many communities are interested, communities of different character and of different size; communities in this broad land of ours, where industrial, climatic and other conditions differ in every respect, where men are sent to the South, where it is continual summer, and to the North, where it is mostly winter, conditions are different, and must be differently handled, and even those in charge of the work in New York cannot put out and cannot lay down rules which will govern every community.

For instance, in this paper, Mr. Bressler refers to the fact that for certain communities the local committees had informed him that there was no need for men, and still, at the same time, the superintendents of certain factories had written for men. That is perfectly natural. The local committee could see further than the superintendents of certain factories, for, in Minneapolis, where we have six months winter, when snow is on the ground, and all outside work is stopped, we are getting men now from Galveston and New York. We have discovered that the superintendent had been placing these men to a great number very easily, and the committee undertook to investigate and found that he had placed

twenty-one men in a sash and screen factory. There at that plant the superintendent will take 21 more. But what is the result? When the flies disappear and the screens are taken off we will have all these men on our hands for the winter. So the office in New York must remember this: The superintendents of factories may need men, but they don't guarantee always to keep them.

Now as to the work the way it is conducted in our city, not a city the size of St. Louis, nor a city of 100,000 inhabitants. We have perhaps 300,000 inhabitants. Our population is composed largely of foreigners, Scandinavians, honest, hard-working people, but who still have a prejudice against the Jew, not born of any intimate relations with him, but from hearsay, because they don't know him as he is. They still harbor that prejudice on account of the tragedy which happened some two thousand years ago. Now we cannot get these men in a great many of our factories. Our flour mills, for instance; there seems to be an unwritten law that a Jew cannot be placed in a flour mill. Also, for instance, plumbers. A Jewish plumber is not taken as an apprentice even, and the Jewish artisans in that trade are those who have already served their apprenticeship in other places. Labor is strongly organized in our community, and when a skilled artisan comes it is one of our first duties to see that he joins the union, and does not antagonize it. When a man comes from New York or Galveston the only difference I find is that the Galveston product comes there to work—he comes to this country for the purpose of earning a living and sending for his family; while at times those sent from New York come from other motives, perhaps some want to travel and see the country.

We have established what we call an immigrant house, where we place the immigrant. Theoretically that is not a good plan; according to Mr. Bressler, we should not segregate them. But we find that we must have some place where we can keep these men together, at least until we get them to work, because we cannot separate them, although in a small city that covers a great deal of territory; we must have them where we can look after them and take care of them. We find an agent must meet them, so they do not come unlooked for and unwelcomed. They are taken to



the immigrant house, a family supplies them room and board for a nominal sum—four dollars a week. After we place them in the immigration house we take them to the bathhouse, where they are given a bath and cleaned up, and we also have a storeroom where clothes are kept, and the first thing we do is to take away their foreign apparel and give them American clothes. We allow them to rest a day and become accustomed to their environment. The following day we seek to give them employment. We tell the employer frankly they are Jews and also explain to them under what conditions they come to this country, and we appeal to the employer to treat them with more consideration than they would give to others, and we find that has a good effect upon the employers. They take a personal interest in the men and overlook a great many of their shortcomings, whereas if the information had not been given beforehand they would not have tolerated them at all. We keep them three weeks and give them board and room. For the reason that many of these men are desirous of sending home their earnings, we permit them to send their earnings home for two weeks and after they are well and thoroughly located we turn them adrift.

If a man through no fault of his own loses his position we get him another; we give him three trials. After the third trial we investigate, and if we find it is his fault we turn him adrift and tell him to shift for himself. Of course, a good many times we have a man whose characteristic is really best expressed in this well-known Hebrew word, "Schlemiel," and we have trouble with him. How easy it would be if we could give them at least a pack or a horse and wagon, but we can't and won't. The B'nai B'rith has been the prime mover in this movement in our community. The B'nai B'rith has instituted in the past two years two night schools, especially for these men—those especially from Galveston. We are especially fortunate in having the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, and the students, young men and young women, give their services to the B'nai B'rith and conduct night schools for immigrants, and in these night schools we prepare them for citizenship, we teach them the language, to read and write, and when we see a man has special ability and that he will take hold we even take

him away from the position that he has and give him a better one and give his position to some newcomer. In that way we endeavor to perfect the work. We endeavor to conduct the work in such a manner that it will create the least trouble in the community.

Of course, we have our disappointments. These must be expected, of course. Many times we criticise the New York office, but I will say, during the last year, since the work has been properly systematized by us, the offices in New York and in Galveston have acceded to our requests and sought to remedy the defects called to their attention, and so work in harmony to eliminate the little troubles between the offices.

Now, the New York office makes mistakes, and, as Mr. Bressler told you, will continue to make mistakes. So if we do make mistakes we will accomplish something, and we find throughout the country that the majority of the criticism of removal work comes because of selfish reasons.

Having that in mind, we are trying our best in our community to assist New York. I believe in this way we can better combat the adverse legislation against immigration than in any other manner.

#### DISCUSSION—(*Continued*).

By RABBI EPHRAIM FRISCH,  
PINE BLUFF, ARK.

If a rabbi of Midrashic times had had the opportunity to discuss Mr. Bressler's paper and had been asked for his opinion of the great movements he and his assistants in New York and his co-workers in Galveston are directing, as the fruits of the munificence of that late prince of philanthropists, Baron de Hirsch, who, when death took away his only child, exclaimed: "My son I have lost, but humanity is my heir," and the munificence, too, of that equally great living prince and seer, Jacob H. Schiff—if, to repeat, the rabbi of those blissful homiletical days had been asked for his opinion, he would have answered in his own Maggid fashion: "Of their work Scripture spoke when it said: 'I will lead them by a way they know not; I will make darkness light and crooked paths straight for them.'" With rare ability have the directors of this

movement, already respectable in its achievements and still more significant in its potentialities, sent streams of strangers at the gate and homeless within the gate from places where they were not needed, or where needed not wanted, to cities and towns where the native population welcomed them cordially, and where the newcomers if they could not in accordance with the pretty ancient vision each "dwell under his own vine and fig tree," they could at least dwell in comfortable homes, reasonably free from material anxiety, with none to disturb them and they disturbing none. When it is remembered that these same people might have had to live four in a room on Broome Street, and that, too, in a dark and dingy room over a hot bakery, or on the fifth floor of a "yardhouse" on Essex Street, and work in an unsanitary shop at starvation wages, their children subject to the demoralizing influences of the streets, getting a chance to enjoy the sight and scent of flowers and grass and trees only a few days a year, when some kindly "Fresh-air" Society took them under its merciful wings—when one compares the life which they might have led with the free and healthy life they are now actually enjoying in their three or four room cottages, with their expanse of lawn and the rosebushes and the fruit trees that people them, one may indeed express his admiration at the wisdom that conceived the plan of distribution, at the generosity that furnished the sinews of war for the campaign and the patience and perseverance of the leaders, yes, even the humble workers in the ranks, who rose superior to criticism, disappointments and mishaps.

Situated at the heart of the movement, with the Industrial Removal Office, as the right lobe and the Galveston Bureau as the left lobe, of the heart, those that superintend the diffusion of the stream of Jewish removals are, nevertheless, as is seen from Mr. Bressler's splendid paper, thoroughly conversant with the conditions that prevail and the needs that exist at the periphery points. They have neither pumped too fast nor too slow; neither caused congestion at the receiving places nor suffered anemia to set in there. Under present conditions the quantity has been just about adequate. The quality, too, has been, generally speaking, of a pure and healthy grade. The writer of the paper is un-

questionably right when he states that a higher and more skilled class of Jewish immigrants are now coming to our country than was the case some time back. Six years ago, when I first became interested in receiving and placing immigrants, the workmen that came to us were considerably less skilled and less manageable, too.

In order to indicate how the removal work operates at a small receiving point of the size and the resources that Mr. Bressler considers most desirable as channels for the Bureau's proteges, I shall recount our experiences with this work in my own town. Pine Bluff is a city of nearly 30,000 population, with a Jewish community of about 700 souls. Except the Cotton Belt Railroad shops, from which, however, for several reasons, we have derived very little benefit for the Jewish immigrant, and except possibly also for a larger lumber industry than usual, we have the same opportunities and the same limitations, too, as regards employment as in other cities of this size. From the Jewish point of view, the conditions are very adequate to receive immigrants from Eastern Europe. Besides the Reform Congregation, we have a Chevrah which meets for service at the holidays and occasionally for Sabbath worship. We have a *Shochet* and *Melammed*, in short, all the prerequisites for bringing up a generation of "Frumme Yidden."

When the Galveston Bureau was established, our town was taken in its territory, and Mr. Waldman, who visited us then, was given a cordial hearing and promised co-operation by several of our business men. We received our first arrivals from Galveston in September, 1907, but, though we have been receiving them theoretically now two and a half years, in reality the time is but one and a half years, as the Bureau did not send us any people during the year of the panic. Altogether, since then, 21 people were sent us—15 men, 4 women and 2 children; 3 children have been born in Pine Bluff, and 1 man was brought over by his married sister on her own account, and he secured a job himself, without our aid. Total "arrivals" due to the Bureau 25. Of these, 16 have remained in Pine Bluff, 3 went to Little Rock, 2 to Vicksburg, 1 to Kansas City, 2 to unknown regions, and 1, a half-witted dreamer, to his

home in Russia. There were 16 wage-earners; of these all but one had occupations—6 being tailors, 2 shoemakers, 2 blacksmiths, 1 ironmoulder, 1 ringmaker, 1 tinner, 1 carpenter and 1 barber. As for wages, the lowest commenced at \$3.50 a week, the highest at \$20.50. They invariably got raised in their wages in a very short while. They average between \$13 and \$15 a week now. All but the ironmoulder, ringmaker and barber are working at their own occupations. They like the city, and want to remain there. Those that moved away did so either because they could obtain no work at their own occupation there, or because of temporary unemployment or in order to join relatives elsewhere. We have had some very gratifying experiences. We have also had some trouble, chiefly in connection with securing work at the beginning. One exploitation of an immigrant by his Jewish employer (which we prosecuted successfully) and 2 wife-desertions may also be numbered among our troubles. The native Jewish people are very friendly to them, and in many cases helpful in giving employment and aid; nearly all of them contribute to the Relief Association, most of the funds of which are now used for the immigrants; a few are ready to give extra sums whenever needed. The orthodox Jews, except the tailors and shoemakers, with whom the newcomers compete, are delighted to receive them, and occasionally help them with jobs. Several of them have become members of the Temple recently, because pleased with our work.

The immigrants become Americanized very rapidly. They learn to speak English quickly, even the older ones. We ran a night school, with four classes, at the Temple, from October to March. One little girl was on the honor roll of the public schools in her first month after landing. The children come to our Sunday-school and all the adults come to our Chanukah and Purim entertainments, and some to our congregational *Seder*, and even to the regular services.

The non-Jewish population is very friendly, and even helpful. More than once, when I missed the immigrants at the station upon their arrival, a policeman guided them to my house. The conductor on the train that brought in a young barber boy asked me



the next day how my young deaf and dumb boy was getting along. He thought he was deaf and dumb because he didn't answer him when he addressed him, so he wrote on his consignment card: "Sit here until I come for you," without getting any further response. The Gentile merchants voluntarily give me discounts on tools purchased for the immigrants. Many were the inquiries the other day when the newspapers published the fact that Leib Kaufman and his wife, our latest arrivals, traveled for 28½ hours without food on their initial ride in America, because of failure on the part of the Dallas representative of the Bureau to bring them food at that point. Ten days ago I accepted an invitation to deliver an address on the "Jewish Industrial and Agricultural Immigrant" before the Jefferson County Land Congress. The Federal agricultural experts and the representatives of the Iron Mountain and Cotton Belt Railroads present expressed their interest in the movement, and Mr. John Gracie, one of the largest, if not the largest individual planter in the Southwest, invited me to visit his plantations, with a view to settling Jewish immigrants there, on the renting or crop-sharing arrangement. The South, and especially the Southwest, is doing its utmost to attract immigrants, and, while it is true that it is chiefly eager to get the Iowa, or Illinois, or Canada farmer, it also bids welcome to the Jew from foreign lands. Herein, as Mr. Bressler ably pointed out, lies the timeliness of the Galveston movement.

The *vade mecum* set up by the author for the receiving city, *i. e.*, that the essential considerations are (1) making the immigrant self-reliant instead of a charity problem, (2) putting him to work at his own occupation and (3) providing him with congenial association and a respectable social status, is a correct one. But it serves better as an ideal than as an actual working program. Taking up the last point first, that is, giving the immigrant a congenial social life, no difficulty need be experienced on this score, if the Bureau will carefully choose only such receiving cities as have a fair nucleus of Eastern Jews already. As for making the immigrant self-reliant, it is easy to do this when you succeed in obtaining employment for him at once and at a living wage. But when no job is available, or the wages are, at the beginning



at least, too small, the local society must either pay for the board and lodging entirely or supplement the wages. For my part I believe in being generous with the money allowances. I have encouraged husbands and sons to send some money to their wives or mothers in Europe long before they made enough to support themselves, and we cheerfully made up the difference. A money order sent to his wife during the first month may prevent a desertion in the sixth month, and five roubles sent to a mother for Pesach may forestall a sundering of domestic relations and even a lapse to irreligion. While it would be more desirable for the immigrants not to receive any financial aid as outright gifts at all, it is better to make them a little dependent than a good deal demoralized or deeply discontented. As to the third essential, *i. e.*, finding them work at their old occupations, that, of course, will be done as far as possible by any sensible local representative. But the Bureau should attempt to make this more feasible than it has done thus far. Much avoidable worry and loss of prestige with employers, and expense, too, have been caused by inaccuracies in the reports sent by the Bureau as to what the specific occupations were. For instance, one man who was described in the consignment as a carpenter proved to be nothing of the kind; but I didn't know that until after I had spent a considerable sum of money in purchasing tools for him and lost my reputation with two contractors. Another man was described as "Jeweler," but he could do only a specialized form of that work. He was really a ringmaker; another, as locksmith, who was really an iron-moulder; another, as shoemaker, who in reality was a factory shoe-hand, belonging in a larger city where shoe factories are found.

The remedy I would suggest for this by no means slight defect in the machinery of proper distribution is the establishment of a test-shop in Galveston, or at least an arrangement for the privilege of testing the immigrants' occupations in already existing private shops, so as to establish definitely just what each immigrant is capable of doing, without depending entirely on his word, as is more or less the case now. It is perfectly natural for a man in sore need of work to say he is skilled in an occupation that will command respect when he really knows little or nothing about it.

It should be the business of the Bureau to verify or disprove his claim. The receiving committee would rather take unskilled laborers as such than waste a lot of time and money and lose local standing in securing positions for the immigrants for which they are not fitted. My plan is not as impracticable nor as expensive as it seems at first blush. About one-third of the arrivals at Galveston being unskilled workmen, they would need no testing at all. Tailors and shoemakers and carpenters, who form the next largest percentages, could easily be tried out in some private shop by agreement, or in an improvised shop established by the Bureau. These four classes, together with the women and children who, of course, need not be tested, constitute 1,021 of the 1,553 persons distributed by the Galveston Bureau, or over 60%. The occupations of the rest, with few exceptions, could be tested with equal ease.

One additional suggestion. According to even the most sanguine promoters of the two Bureaus, the scope of distribution will always remain more or less restricted under the present limited resources for employment. At best, the number of newcomers distributed may be tripled or quadrupled; the possibility of providing work for and assimilating the immigrants through the present channels will hardly admit of a distribution exceeding 20,000 a year. Granting that these will form a nucleus for larger voluntary immigration, what does this slight deflection amount to in changing the channel of the vast stream of Jewish immigration? It is like attempting to put out a big fire with the old-fashioned barrel and squirter. That is better than nothing, it is true, but best of all is a quick, up-to-date and adequate fire-extinguishing system. It seems to me the time has arrived for the Jews of America to do something more than to pass indignant resolutions on Russian atrocities and utter pious wishes in favor of the "Back-to-the-Soil" movement. It is time to do something really serious and on a large scale to turn the Jewish immigrant to agricultural pursuits. Now I am saying this in full knowledge of the many past failures in that direction and perfectly aware that my opinion is both that of a theorist and a young man. It seems to me, however, that the failures thus far have been due to the *specific*

*forms* that the experiments have taken, and not to any inherent weakness in the plan. No wonder Jewish agricultural colonies have almost invariably failed thus far. Either poor land or sickly regions were chosen; or crop failures were not figured on and no arrangement was established for immediate returns, which the tiller, like all other human beings, desires; there was either too much supervision and paternalism or none at all. It is still in place to try other methods. Suppose, for instance, a series of training farms for single and family men be established in various regions of the country, chiefly in the sparsely settled but rich lands of the South, where fodder is available ten months in the year, and where more than a dozen kinds are found; where stock and poultry can be raised at the minimum cost; where the rice and other new industries are now bringing enormous profits; where everything can be grown from vegetables to cotton and corn, with but comparatively little labor, nature being so prolific and mild there. Supposing all the immigrants without specific occupations and as many more as cannot be placed to advantage in industrial positions be put to work there and be paid \$1 a day, besides board and lodging, and that they be put under the direction of such an unknown but able scientific farmer like Mr. Cobb, the superintendent of the Chickasha, Miss., County Agricultural High School, who probably gets a much smaller salary than the graduates of the Doylestown Farm School want; supposing the immigrants were limited in their stay at the training farms to one season, so as to make room for the new immigrants that would ever keep on arriving; supposing that when they leave the training farm, the superintendent assist them in purchasing a tract of land nearby from their savings?

What would be the results? (1) The Bureaus could send an almost unlimited number of people direct to the training farms without being dependent as at present on the limited resources of the receiving cities. Each training farm would be capable of expansion or contraction as the need may be; (2) there would be created a powerful and yet natural tendency for the immigrants to turn to agriculture as a permanent pursuit, a condition good for the immigrant, desired by us city Jews and highly pleasing

to the American people; (3) it would save the immigrant from exploitation, from falling into lawless habits and from being jerked out of his faith suddenly and violently; (4) it would be a flexible system—those who feel independent enough to leave the training farm before the year is over and start on their own account in other lines of work might do so with the full approval, yes, with the encouragement of the Bureaus; (5) the expense would be great only at the beginning; at the end of the season the training farm will probably have been found to be an institution that paid its own way. It cost our town on an average of \$15 to start an immigrant. We would be willing to pay that much to the training farm and more. This winter three tracts of good land were offered to me free of rent for several years. The Board of Trade of nearly every smaller city offers large tracts of land free for such purposes. Besides, it must not be forgotten that a good deal of money spent by the Bureaus for transportation needlessly, because not free to choose the objective point or because of ill-chosen consignments, could be economized. And there are always a good many privates who are willing to contribute materially for such a humanitarian purpose. I leave this suggestion to your kindly consideration.

MR. CYRUS L. SULZBERGER, New York: About three years ago, during the time that I was president of the Jewish Agricultural and Industrial Aid Society, we instituted a training farm. We had all the ideas which Rabbi Frisesh has explained to you with such eloquence.

That farm is now upon the market. Well, now I don't intend to say how much money we used. We conducted the experiments in those three years, and we failed to produce satisfactory results, and it is now in the hands of a real estate broker for sale. I don't need to go into the details of the failure in that experiment, but we believed in the first instance that it should have worked out as Rabbi Frisesh thinks it ought to work out. I think it ought, and so it should have.

I wish to say to you that Mr. Senior is in error: It is not a question of a man staying on the farm. None of them left the farm. I don't care to go into the reasons for our failure on that farm, but unwillingness to remain had no relation to it what-

ever. It might have been in the heart of California, or in the heart of New York, but this consideration did not enter into it in this instance in the slightest degree.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have so often at these conferences talked about this removal work that I find it difficult to find anything more to say; and yet a slip of the tongue made by Mr. Bressler in the opening of his paper gives me a text. He wanted to speak of the "systematic distribution," and he said—and corrected the mistake—"sympathetic distribution." He should have let it stand, for the key to the whole situation was in that slip of the tongue when he said "sympathetic distribution," because that is the kernel of the whole matter. In no sense or manner, as a matter of fact, should removal work make a part of charity, because in no sense is it true charity.

Was it not said in your presence last night that Jewish charity differs from ordinary charity? This is not true charity. This is a vast religious and social movement, of great importance to all people in the United States, Jewish and un-Jewish, along political and social lines.

The United States Government a few years ago established a Bureau of Distribution, and has failed with that bureau—failed so lamentably that propositions are now before Congress for its abolition. I shall not take any of your time in giving you statistics of the little work done by that bureau during the two years of its existence, but it has done less, with all the vast resources of the United States Government behind it, than the Removal Bureau in the same period, with only this organization behind it, and yet the work the Government is now contemplating abandoning is the most important work it could possibly continue, and because this work is so important—is so important for the United States Government—therefore it becomes more incumbent upon us—having successfully set the movement in motion, having successfully carried it on for nine years—to carry it on with renewed and increased effort so that we may teach the United States how distribution may be continued in order that the vast number of immigrants arriving with every steamship load of arrivals may not be diverted from us; in order that we may not lose the benefits



that come to us by that immigration. Our social movement must proceed intelligently along with every measure, and if we do not do this, this wild, unfounded cry, created by immigration restrictionists, and making headway through the ill-informed public, will eventually succeed in closing the doors at the ports of entry, resulting not alone in the horrors which that would mean to intending Jewish immigrants, but resulting further in the loss of the benefits which the Jewish immigrants would bring to the country at large.

Therefore, the work which we are now doing is not in any sense a charitable work. The work we are now engaged in is a vast social and economic movement, and it is our privilege as Jews to show the people of the United States and the United States Government how to continue with the work we have successfully launched.

Those of you who have had some experience by working in cooperation with the Industrial Removal Office say: "Oh, yes, but they are such difficult people that you ask us to deal with." Mr. Weil told us about the prejudices that he encountered, about the labor unions that make trouble and the trouble with suitable industries, and Rabbi Frisch told us that he is still suffering from the barber, yet I am not going to lie awake tonight about Rabbi Frisch's sufferings, because he has a panacea for all of those trials—he takes them laughingly. Now, you cannot imagine how many of the troubles and ills of life you can laugh away if you will only make up your mind.

If Rabbi Frisch had been like some people I know, he would have sat down and written Mr. Bressler a long letter about that barber and said: "Don't send me any more of your people."

**RABBI FRISCH:** It is only skin deep.

**MR. SULZBERGER (continuing):** It is not in the skin; it is in the brain; he knew how to take it.

Bear in mind, ladies and gentlemen, that no one comes to us in New York and says: "There is a steamer coming up the harbor, and there are a thousand Jewish immigrants on board of her." They don't usually come a thousand to a steamer. They don't say "There is a large number of Jewish immigrants, and some



are barbers who can't shave, and some are carpenters who can't carp. What do you want us to do with them, dump them into the bay or let them land?" And if they told us we would let them land; some of us would anyhow, but they don't even go through the formality of asking us; they let them land, and there they are. And, believe me, we have troubles, too, and, I venture to say, ladies and gentlemen, that if the order had gone out last week that the Jewish residents there get out; if that order had been that the New York residents get out; if we had gone to Kieff; don't you believe the Kieff people would have troubles, too?

We know what nice people we are; we know what vivacious people we are; we know how pleasant it is to associate with us; we know how people ought to like to have us come to them, and don't you believe the Kieff people would have all these troubles if we had come to them, even well equipped with worldly goods? But if, in addition to that, we had been stripped of our worldly goods before being sent out from New York instead of Kieff, don't you suppose they would have had their hands pretty full?

Because, after all, it is not that the barber doesn't know how to shave, or the carpenter doesn't know how to handle tools, but it is that you have violently wrenched the man away from the environment in which he belongs, in which he was born and in which he learned his trade, and violently thrust him into a new environment, which he cannot adequately understand, and the only wonder is that so many of them do in a wonderfully short time adjust themselves to the new environment.

We hear a lot, and a great deal more than the facts justify, about the misdeeds of the immigrant. Don't forget that decent living is done quietly. I have never yet encountered in a newspaper—and I read the newspapers with fair regularity—I never yet picked up a newspaper and read: "Brother Billikopf is supporting his wife and family." It is not that it is not of importance; of course, it is. But if he is not supporting his family, then you are apt to read about it. Bear in mind that the good going on in the land is going on unheralded, and when you read about this, that and the other malefactor, you are apt to think that this is the test of the whole. It is not.

The statistics to which Judge Mack referred last night show—and I know the statistics are correct, because I gathered them myself—that the percentage of wrongdoing on the part of the Jewish immigrant is less than that on the part of the native-born. That shows the percentage of illiteracy on the part of the foreign-born to be less than on the part of the native-born. Not only is that true where illiteracy is the greatest, in the South, but it is true even in the North, that theirs is a higher standard of education than that of the bulk of the native-born. I say this with no particular pride—being native-born myself—but it is the truth, and it is time the people of the United States knew these truths, because they have for so many years been misled in connection with immigration.

The work that has been done in Minneapolis, and in Kansas City, and in Pine Bluff, and in hundreds of other cities in the United States is work that can be duplicated in every city in which there is a Jewish community.

The appeal that we make to you is this: You have signified by the manner in which you received Judge Mack's appeal last night that you are in sympathy with the proposition that immigration will not be restricted in this country. Signalize that movement by carrying with you in your persons a willingness to cooperate in this work, and if you are willing to co-operate carry it to your neighboring communities, so that we may have throughout the United States ramifications, agencies, which, in a greater or smaller degree, aid in this vast problem of so much importance. not alone to the Jews, but to all the people of the United States.

PRESIDENT HOLLANDER: This completes the formal discussion of the topic, which will now be discussed in a less formal manner on the floor, with strict regard to the five-minute rule.

Among those whose names appear on the program there is no one which represents the South, which is the center of the Galveston movement. I shall therefore exercise the arbitrary right of the chairman and call upon one who, when you have heard him, you will admit has not set his face against the problem so successfully as Rabbi Frisch, and you will be pleased to hear from our old friend, Rev. Leucht.

RABBI I. L. LEUCHT, New Orleans: I once attended a convention in Indianapolis, and we were called upon to give our report by States. By some lapse the secretary jumped Louisiana, and when I got the floor I told him that when I left my home I believed Louisiana yet belonged to the Union, and, therefore, I would like to be heard. And I am in a like position today. All the speakers so far that have been heard on this subject have come from the Northwest. I have also listened to Rabbi Frisch, who has resided in the South for a short time, but he is not a Southern man. Mr. Chairman, I have been living in New Orleans for the last forty years, and I will say that I was one of the first men in our section who came to the relief of New York when the request was sent out to take some Russian Jews off their hands. I do not know whether what I have to say will be in keeping with your views or with the remarks that have been made before us. Mr. President, we have all sorts of difficulties in the South. So far as Mississippi, Louisiana and Texas are concerned, we are co-operating with each other as to how we can take hold and assist in the great movement that confronts the United States today.

We are confronted in the first place by the negro question. The Southern man prefers having a negro laborer on his farm to one of our race, and we found out by experience that both cannot and will not work together.

The second thing, we have to battle against an uncomfortable climate in the months of June, July, August and September, which is not to the taste of the newcomer.

Third, we have hardly any factories to speak of.

So you see, Mr. Chairman, that we are met everywhere by great difficulties. Nevertheless, we are highly interested in this Galveston movement. But, I want to say here, it is perfectly useless, as far as we are concerned, to send us a great number of Russian Jews at one time. We are not able to place them. For instance, we took into one factory nineteen men and found work for them. Hardy had they been there three weeks before they were discharged.

We are notified by the New York Removal Office that a steamer is coming from Hamburg to New Orleans and we probably will

have a great many immigrants to care for and find occupations for and place them. Then what are we going to do? If such a shipload, say of about 300 Russian Jews, would arrive at one and the same time it would be utterly impossible to place them.

But I want to remind the man who has charge of the Galveston movement, and those of the city of New York as well, that New Orleans, while it is one of the main ports of the South, cannot do more than her geographic position—and further reasons which I have already mentioned—permits us to accomplish.

Mr. President, in order to show that we do not propose to shirk our duty, I want to make the statement that of all the Russians we have so far received there is not a single Russian Jew in our city who is on the charitable list of our societies.

PRESIDENT HOLLANDER: I very much regret, for the sake of the admirable logic that was otherwise contained in Dr. Leucht's remarks, that he should have marred it by his last sentence.

DR. LEUCHT: On the contrary, I want to prove to you that my position is correct, and his is not. I say in the last sentence that New Orleans, in spite of all difficulties, has placed the Russian Jew in such position that today not one receives charity.

MR. S. H. FROHLICHSTEIN, St. Louis: On the line of the remarks made by Mr. Sulzberger there was a movement made that, in my judgment, will be of considerable help to the Removal Office.

Last week District Grand Lodge No. 2, of the B'nai B'rith, convened in this city, and a committee was appointed on removal work. This committee brought in a set of resolutions, which were adopted, which are not very long and which I would like to read to the convention.

The recommendations of the committee were as follows:

"We, therefore, recommend that a permanent district removal and employment bureau be established. The president shall appoint this committee, to be composed as follows: The chairman thereof shall be one of the members of the General Committee of District Grand Lodge No. 2; there shall be seven other members appointed, one member from each of the seven States comprising this district; these members to be known as State chairmen. The State chairmen shall see that each lodge of the B'nai B'rith in his State

appoints a committee, who shall look after this work in its locality; he shall also organize the chairmen of the local committees into a State committee, so that the entire State may be thoroughly looked after. This general committee shall work in thorough accord with the Industrial Removal Office of New York, and shall devise the best methods of carrying on this work in the various localities."

In connection with these resolutions, I want to make this statement: In appointing this committee the president appointed five gentlemen, all of whom were from large cities, and who are actively engaged in this work. I was among those first to find fault with sending people to the smaller cities, owing to the fact that a few years ago when these people began to think that they could take part in the work if they were permitted to do so. After taking a number of people from the Removal Office they permitted these people to leave their community after a very short time, and sent them to the larger cities, where they became a burden to the said cities to which they were sent. Mr. Sulzberger and Mr. Bressler will remember how some of the larger cities discontinued entirely sending for people on account of this drift that came to them from the smaller towns.

In the passing of these resolutions by the convention I distinctly stipulated that they were offered with the understanding that any city, be it ever so small, where there is a lodge, should not write the committee for any more removals than they could positively take care of, and before writing they should make sure that the one or two they call for would be made permanent residents and not allowed to drift to the larger cities, and if they permit them to go the lodge permitting it would be responsible for these persons or families.

So much for that. Now about our work here. Ever since the organization of the Removal Office St. Louis has taken more than its quota, and I think that it has taken from New York more than any one city in the United States. This work we started nine years ago. Two years ago Mr. Bressler made a trip here and we took a census. We found 83 per cent. of the people were here then. After nine years I think we can safely say that we



have now between 2,500 and 2,800 of these people, including men, women and children, who are permanent residents.

Here we have no kick against the Removal Office, except they don't send us enough people. Recently I wrote Mr. Bressler to send us some two or three people selected from the list he submitted to us, but finding that he could not send us these people I wrote him to send us anyone he could pick out, if it was a man with two arms, two legs, eyes, ears and a nose and under the age of sixty years.

Some two or three weeks ago I went over to our Labor Bureau Office and found our manager seated at his desk reading a paper at a time when he should be out looking for employment for applicants. When I put the question to him: "Is this the way you attend to your business?" he answered: "I have nothing to do. I have eighteen positions open and not an applicant for work, and have had no applicants for several days. Get the Removal Office to send us some people here as we have the positions."

As far as St. Louis is concerned we will take them from either New York or Galveston and will find work for them within forty-eight hours.

MR. JACOB BILLIKOPF, Kansas City: Mr. Bressler's paper was so very splendid, both from a practical and an academic point of view and the discussions that followed it have been so full of detail, that anything I may add to the subject may appear superfluous. The feature in Mr. Bressler's paper with which I am more or less thoroughly familiar and which interests me particularly, is the one pertaining to an analysis of the Galveston movement.

Kansas City, co-operating as it does with the Galveston Bureau in its distributive work, to a much larger extent than any other interior agency, it may not be amiss to detail in brief some of our experiences. From August 1, 1909, until May 1, this year, we received from Galveston about 125 men and women, some of whom drifted to our community from neighboring towns. They represented about 34 different trades, such as tailors, shoemakers, carpenters, tanners, butchers, blacksmiths, machinists, etc. In the great majority of instances we were successful in placing them



at their respective trades, and almost invariably work was procured for them within a week after their arrival in our city. During the above period we found, on the average, about three jobs for each individual.

In addition to finding them suitable employment at fairly remunerative wages, we aim to surround them, from the moment they land in our community, with such educational and cultural advantages as will equip them for citizenship. We maintain a night school, consisting of six classes, which meet four times a week, under the instruction of capable, paid teachers, and the progress the immigrants are making is truly remarkable. I may say, in this connection, that a great number of the married men have already sent for their families and others, again have fairly substantial bank accounts. What is truly significant about this movement is that some of our people have succeeded in inducing relatives and friends, who have been residents in the East for several years, to come to Kansas City, where better opportunities awaited them.

Now, in the discussion of so vital a problem as the diversion of immigration, we cannot lose sight of the fact that there are many difficulties, which present themselves from time to time, and some of the objections brought out by Mr. Jonas Weil and, particularly, by Rabbi Frisch deserve some consideration. And yet I feel that at a gathering of this nature, where people come from all parts of the country to study the larger questions effecting our people, we cannot afford to discuss individual cases, but we must view the various problems from the largest possible point of view. And it is for this reason that, at the suggestion of Mr. Bressler, I take the liberty to read a communication which I recently received from Mr. Jacob H. Schiff, the projector of the Galveston movement—a communication which deserves the most careful study and consideration on account of the great message he presents to the Jews of this country. Mr. Schiff writes:

“I am in receipt of your valued letter of the 28th ulto., with a summary of results obtained by a group of immigrants, consisting of 89 married and 23 unmarried men, who have come to Kansas City through the Port of Galveston, and of whom, between 80

and 90 per cent., as you state, are still in Kansas City, employed at their respective trades.

This is certainly a most satisfactory showing, and proves best the correctness of the contention of the promoters of the Galveston movement, that Russian-Jewish immigration, if only properly controlled and placed, is certain to result in advantage to our country. The great difficulty is that the seaport towns, more especially New York, are becoming so largely congested that problems result from the overpopulation thus created *in these towns*, and more particularly *in New York*, which are difficult of solution, and which unless solved, are becoming a menace to the standing of the Jew in our country. *Because* of this, it is important that every effort be made and supported by our co-religionists throughout the country to deflect Jewish immigration from the seaport towns, and rather make it to flow into the great American Hinterland, extending from the Mississippi to the Pacific, and from the Gulf to the Canadian Frontier and beyond, where the laborer is still more considerably needed, where dwelling conditions are far superior to the crowded seaport towns, and where there is room yet, with proper distribution, for large numbers of our co-religionists, so hard driven in the domain of the Russian Czar.

"There can be no doubt that the Russian Jew is a splendid stock. He not only makes it possible through his work that we maintain and extend our commercial supremacy, of which, with our materialistic tendencies, we stand in great need.

"It is therefore much of a satisfaction to those who have the Galveston movement in charge that you and others have given this movement such practical co-operation, and if we can only continue during the next decade to plant the seed for a larger Jewish population in the American Hinterland, I feel very certain that, in decades to come, the standing and influence of the Jew in this country will become such that our posterity will have no cause to regret the welcome their fathers have given to the persecuted Russian Jew.

"Very truly yours,

(Signed) "JACOB H. SCHIFF."

MR. JACOB FURTH, St. Louis: As a member of the Executive Committee of the Independent Order of the B'nai B'rith, I want to thank you, Mr. President, for giving me the opportunity to say just one word in connection with the distribution of immigrants.

I fully agree with Mr. Billikopf that the proper way to discuss a paper presented on the floor of this convention is to take a broad view rather than to go into details. We come to the Conference biennially to strengthen ourselves, receive information, and to thoroughly post ourselves so that we may be able to go through the length and breadth of the land and intelligently discuss questions pertaining to the welfare of the American Jew, as well as of the Jewish immigrant.

I want to discuss this question from a broad standpoint. I don't want to be personal. I don't want to find fault with the paper under discussion, but I would like to make this suggestion: When a program is made up for our conferences; when the subjects and topics are assigned, they should, in my judgment, be treated not from one viewpoint alone. There are two sides to every question, and each side should, in my judgment, be given the opportunity to be heard.

If the subject matter of Mr. Bressler's paper had been thus subdivided, we might have had the opportunity to hear it discussed not only from the standpoint of the New Yorker, but also from that of citizens of the interior. I listened very carefully to the wording of Mr. Bressler's paper, and intended to take down some objections, but, fortunately, I did not find that necessary. In every instance that I intended to take objection, he offered an apology for his view-point, and consequently I had nothing to object to. The paper presented was of imposing length and gave many details, but it was rather apologetic in its nature. What struck me as most disagreeable, and particularly so as coming from the gentlemen who offered the paper, was that when treating of the origin of the Removal Office he omitted to mention the name of that great man, whose wisdom evolved the plan of the institution.

We must always bear in mind that Leo N. Levi was the man whose genius suggested the formation of the organization to

remove immigrants from the congested districts in the Eastern seaport cities, so that they might find homes elsewhere. It was my proud privilege to co-operate with the late leader in this movement. While the underlying principle of the Removal Office was industrial in character, it was not altogether so. It was his idea to raise the moral and ethical level of the people and to use his own language—"to give the boys the opportunity to become decent men and to give the girls the opportunity to become virtuous women."

The industrial part of the program was outlined by the great philanthropist, Baron de Hirsch. The name of the organization has been well selected and strictly in accordance with the Baron's ideas. The first two million dollars which he contributed were given absolutely for industrial purposes. He intended to give to the immigrants an opportunity to enlarge their views, improve their condition and scatter through the length and breadth of the land rather than remain in the tenement houses of the congested districts.

One word in Mr. Bressler's paper grated harshly on my ears. I had never heard it used in connection with any part of the United States, and I believe it never has been used in that way outside of Manhattan Island. It is the word "Hinterland." I didn't know there was a "Hinterland" in America. I don't believe anyone in the West or in the South knows of a "Hinterland." It is an un-American word and I regret that it was ever used either by Mr. Bressler or others in connection with the immigrant problem.

One more word before my time expires. I believe the subject matter of Mr. Bressler's paper should have been subdivided into two parts. The one might have treated of the removal work in general and the other of the Galveston movement. We should have separate and distinct reports on these great movements, and particularly of the Galveston movement. It seems that with all the means and the machinery at the command of the Removal Office not more than 3,500 people were handled throughout the entire country.

RABBI M. SAMFIELD, Memphis: I should have been derelict in my duty as the representative of the B'nai B'rith Chapter of Memphis—having lived for almost forty years in the South—if I did not add my testimony, and, at the same time, make a statement of the experience I have had like our friend, Dr. Leucht. I had the same experience as he had, only I had an agricultural experiment, and I wish to say, that in taking up the cause of the Jewish immigrant, which it is our solemn duty to do, and no community ought to shirk that duty, that we must come to the conclusion that the Russian Jew is more apt to succeed in the commercial pursuits than in any other pursuits that he can undertake. In various communities in the United States I have had the experience, and I know that we went about it practically and deliberately, and we selected only those who had been farmers already in Russia, and yet we failed. We failed in a colony that comprised about sixteen or eighteen families. These families went off after they had already succeeded, after three years of farming and getting a surplus profit of not less than \$2,000, but although they were financially successful it seems the invitations extended to them by relatives and friends to enter commercial pursuits instead of continuing farming were too much for them, and they all left that colony.

I have in Memphis a colony of about 600 families—I call it a colony because the newspapers often talk about it, and I wish to say to you that in the different courts of our city since the last six years the Russian Jew has come in contact with the law. We are educating their children; we propose establishing a kindergarten for the Russians down in our Temple. Ladies and gentlemen are engaged in teaching children at night school, and the number commencing with 12 we now have about 50 or 60 of these Russian Jews.

The success of the Russian Jew in the commercial pursuits is evident from the fact that in 1880 I had care of about 60 Russians. Forty of them resided in Memphis, and you will be surprised to hear that at least 10 of these have been successful merchants, and 6 of these 10 can go to New York and buy goods on credit in



amounts from \$15,000 to \$20,000, all made from 1880 to the present date.

Now one matter that I wish to mention, and that is that in the agricultural pursuits in the South, as Dr. Leucht has already stated, there are a great many difficulties, and one of them is the climate. I was instrumental in starting a colony in Texas, and there were many serious sacrifices, so that I take it that we have to take into consideration first of all that while it is not altogether a charitable function to assist the Russian immigrant, that is, beginning with the time he comes, it is in part a charitable proposition, and that all these communities to which Russian Jews are sent ought to be told to guard and put forth their time and energy and spend money in order to secure that they become good American citizens.

PRESIDENT HOLLANDER: Mr. Bressler will now take a very few minutes in summing up.

MR. BRESSLER: The discussion of this session's paper has brought out very clearly that there is practical unanimity regarding the importance for, and need of, carrying on the work of distribution. Therefore, it hardly seems necessary to avail myself of the privilege of the last word upon the subject. We are all agreed as to the principle, though we may differ occasionally as to the method and detail. These, to wit, method and detail, being altogether dependent upon judgment and experience, can easily be changed or adjusted to suit the particular needs of each community. I make no bones about the fact that we have made mistakes, and if our friends throughout the country will only do themselves justice by admitting that they too have made mistakes, they will show that they are as human as we are. So far as the home office is concerned, I might predict many things, but I can only promise one thing, which I am quite sure we can keep, and that is that we will continue to make mistakes—not deliberately or consciously, but those little mistakes and errors of judgment that are common to people who attempt to do things. There are many of you here who are at the head of large business enterprises, who deal in articles which can be appraised with absolute exactness, who employ high-salaried experts and specialists in every branch of



your business, whose duty it is, among other things, to minimize the possibilities of errors occurring, and yet despite this I don't believe that there is one here who has not at one time or another suffered materially as a result of mistake in judgment or misplaced confidence. And so, when sitting in judgment upon us for occasional lapse from infallibility, I ask that you bear in mind your own experience; and when you will remember that we have not the same facility for finding such eminent specialists in human souls as you have in your various businesses, then you will realize that we are doing the best we can.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE AND SECRETARY'S REPORT.

MR. MARTIN A. MARKS, Cleveland: Mr. President, the Committee on President's Message and Secretary's Report begs to submit its report, as follows:

*To the Members of the National Conference of Jewish Charities:*

We, the Committee to whom was referred the message of the President of this Conference and the report of the Secretary, beg leave to report:

That we voice the sentiments of all the members of the Conference present, of appreciation of the splendid and instructive report submitted to us by the President. We are sure same will be read with much interest by all the constituent organizations that are connected with the Conference, also the subscribers to the Conference proceedings. The President's report will add a valuable contribution to the literature on the subject of Jewish philanthropy, and we recommend that the same be published in pamphlet form and widely distributed.

The thanks of this Conference are hereby tendered to President Jacob H. Hollander for his valuable and efficient services to the Conference.

We also wish to extend our thanks to the Secretary, Mr. Louis H. Levin, for the inestimable services he has gratuitously rendered to the Conference. We are pleased to state that the various recommendations embodied in his report have already met with the approval of the members of the Executive Committee, and same

will be embodied in the report of the Committee on Resolutions. We trust that they will meet with the hearty approval of the Conference.

Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL S. FLEISHER, Chairman;  
JACOB BILLIKOPF,  
MARTIN A. MARKS.

On motion, the report was unanimously adopted.

PRESIDENT HOLLANDER: The meeting stands adjourned.

Wednesday, May 18, 1910.

#### EVENING SESSION.

VICE-PRESIDENT MARTIN A. MARKS: The Conference will come to order.

I take pleasure in introducing to you Miss Minnie F. Low, of Chicago, who will read a paper on "Legal Aid."

The following paper on "Legal Aid" was read by Miss Low:

#### LEGAL AID

BY MINNIE F. LOW,

Superintendent of the Bureau of Personal Service,  
CHICAGO, ILL.

The idea of Legal Aid, as a factor in the curriculum of Social Service, has received neither thought nor attention commensurate with its importance at the hands of social workers, nor has the charitably inclined public any clear conception of the nature and need of this, more or less complicated branch of the newer philanthropy. In the course of charitable evolution, the introduction of preventive and protective methods, has not progressed consistently with the general advance in the many other important affairs of our modern civilization. Whether it be timidity, a shirking of responsibility, or the fear of overburdening a community, cannot be definitely stated; but, it must be conceded that there is, and has been, retarded growth and expansion, along the lines of up-to-date, logical methods, ways and means of intelli-

gently meeting the issues of the day. It is the irresistible pressure of legitimate demands, that forces such issues, and generates the motor impulse stirring the responsive few to action.

When the Bureau of Personal Service first opened its doors, its objects were those employed by the Charity Organization Societies of our larger cities. However, from the very inception of the work, in the congested Jewish quarters, there came daily to our doors a large number of both men and women, asking for aid in legal matters, of every conceivable classification. There was manifestly evident, so far as our Jewish Charities were concerned, a well defined gap, with not the slightest provision for affording relief to a class of people, clearly deserving. Their mental anguish, and financial distress, owing to litigation in its various phases, were palpably evident. Hundreds upon hundreds of our co-religionists were suffering the disastrous effects, physically, mentally and financially of legal entanglement, without redress. Many of these were ignorant, ill-advised, or unadvised, and most of them were penniless. They were wholly at the mercy of a merciless, grinding legal machinery, slow, cumbersome, unjust. For, sad to say, it takes the poor, unsophisticated foreigners but a short time to appreciate, that legal justice is an attribute wholly incomprehensible, and inconsistent to their moral conception of fair adjudication.

After a careful investigation of the question of Legal Aid, in its various aspects, and a cautious analysis of the justice of the demands made upon us, we concluded that this, hitherto unexplored field of charitable endeavor, was not only practicable, but that it was necessary, and that the possibilities for good were without limit. The few Jewish workers, facing these problems in their daily routine, could no longer temporize with conscience, by refusing and rejecting the many piteous appeals; and thus unequipped and practically unprepared, our entire working plans were changed, to meet the demands made upon us. The appeals of our applicants presented not only the bitter cry of the harassed, occasioned through fear of arrest, imprisonment, or extended litigation and injustice, but in such appeals, as well, were expressed the hopelessness of poverty and defeat. Struggling

against a combination of conditions torturing in the extreme, it was little wonder that some of them turned to friendly neighbors for help. And thus, it was the demand made by the people themselves, that put into motion, this newer branch of Social Work, so indispensable to the development of a well-rounded system of personal service in a large city.

Were there swift and incontrovertible justice by bar and bench; were technical law consistent with humane, moral, equitable, adjustment of affairs, and were the practices of those representing the bar based uniformly on high-grade ethics, charitable interference in legal matters, would play a minor part. Unfortunately, however, the law, in many instances is hard, cruel, and not calculated to protect the best interests of society, or of the individual. Unfortunately, too, the ethics of members of the bar do not always insure honorable dealing and particularly is this so among a class of lawyers available for small fees in technically inconsequential matters. It is because of latent qualities of justice in both the system and the individual, that charitable interference is not only kind, but is necessary. The helplessness of the ignorant, indigent foreigner, coming inadvertently under the ban of the law, must necessarily appeal to anyone familiar with legal procedure and the many distressing, harrassing features incident thereto. Reconstruction of the Judicial branch of our government, simplification of procedure, the application of system and business-like methods, would minimize the dire effect of litigation in preventing the present day, needless sacrifice of time, money and vitality. Through unsophisticated ignorance, unexpectedly, without the slightest premonition, by sheer accident, as it were, it is possible to become an offender against the law. To make such an offender pay the penalty demanded by technical law, is a travesty on justice, a wrong against society, and a crime against the individual.

Careful inquiry into the administration of justice in our courts today shows neither satisfactory nor logical conclusions. There can be no logical excuse to the commonsense, reasonable being, imbued with a love of humanity, and gifted with the proper attitude towards a better society, for the expensive, dilatory, irksome methods of court procedure, universally in vogue. Delays alone,

barring other injustices and hardships, are the root of glaring inconsistencies, resulting in untold anguish to the poor man, or the wage-worker, who, at best, has not the means to pay the price of justice. Instead of carrying a purchase price, making it accessible to every good citizen, in conformity with its basic principle, justice is the most costly commodity of a modern society.

Another remarkable inconsistency, and one not satisfactorily explained, is why such undue weight should be given to technicalities. Technical delays, are for the most part, not brought in good faith; are inimical to the best interests of society, and are the means of completely disregarding, and obliterating the moral issues of a case, being thus flagrantly at variance with the first elements of justice. The overthrow of the reign of technicalities, especially where no substantial consideration of justice is involved, and where such overthrow would conserve the moral issues, would also mean a great victory to indigent litigants. The grounds for delays are strained in most instances, truth is perverted and the adherence to strict legal rule is used as a subterfuge to pervert honorable, moral adjudication. For, looking the conditions squarely in the face, must it not be conceded that, only too often, he who plays the game most skilfully, backed by artifice and means, is the one who ultimately wins?

The American Bar Association, last year, in a code of professional ethics, hinted at the abuses practiced and sustained in Court procedure "by nullification of law through technicality, and the defeat of substantial justice through delays, quibblings and the setting up of questionable plans and defenses for evading and thwarting legislation, contrary to the best public policy." Another sentiment expressed was that "no client, whether corporate or individual, however powerful, nor any cause, civil, or political, however important, is entitled to service or advice involving disloyalty to the law." The legal profession at large concedes these weaknesses and inconsistencies; the Social Worker knows them to be a fact. In the face of the many digressions from real justice in our system, is there any reason why the poor man, unable to break down the barriers or to remove the obstacles, should not seek some means of extricating himself? We cannot expect members of the



bar to interest themselves to any great extent in the needs of the poor. Their professional talents are to them, what wares are to the merchant, and cannot be dispensed free of cost without injury to their legitimate business. Where then is the medium through which the poor man shall secure justice, for without means, he cannot secure it, under the present day social mal-adjustment. He comes under the ban of customary, oppressive practices alike with the rich. The man of means can afford to wait; can afford to pay handsomely while biding his time, with the hope of ultimate favorable outcome. Money can purchase prolonged protection to the offender of means, and prevent the infliction of injustice to the innocent; but the poor man has no protection against injustice, for if he be charged with crime, unless he has the wherewithal to get proper legal advice, and perchance to pay for a bond, he is compelled to languish behind the bars, until the slow process of the Courts allows him an opportunity to prove his innocence. Our legal machinery instead of lending speedy justice, grinds into the hearts and souls of hundreds upon hundreds of its citizens each year, the shame of bar and cell and prison life, before they have an opportunity to extricate themselves.

While there is a certain class of clients, who can pay for inferior legal talent, many do so at the expense of their families, depriving their children of the necessities of life, and incurring endless hardships. Such litigants are not only not assured of intelligent service, but are only too often at the mercy of a class of lawyers, whose ethics are unsound, whose methods are questionable, and whose interest in their clients is subservient to the many influences, which are a menace and a temptation to the profession. When the man of limited means has given his last available dollar for a defense, without redress or result; when justice has been delayed, or denied, because of mediocre presentation, or indifference on the part of counsel, or perchance because the Court has not been properly informed of all the facts, legal and moral, there is every reasonable excuse for charitable interference to end the nerve-racking suspense, the fear, and mental anguish of the oppressed.



Convinced beyond a doubt that much of the distress we witnessed was entirely avoidable, the Social Workers interested in the Jewish philanthropies of Chicago introduced a number of preventive measures with gratifying, positive results. One line of work yielding tangible returns has been that in connection with our Police Stations. Among the busiest of these centers is the one located in the congested Jewish district of the West Side. This building also houses a branch of our Municipal Court. In this Station, so convenient to residents, neighborhood people went daily in large numbers to air their troubles,—real, imaginary, serious, and inconsequential. Here, through unscrupulous pettifoggers and others preying on the pockets of the unsuspecting, unnecessary, malicious litigation was incited, and hundreds of needless, preventable arrests were made during the course of a year, resulting in untold distress to our already overburdened poor.

Because so many trifling differences were magnified and distorted; because many through lack of proper guiding and friendly advice, joined the vast army of litigants, we felt that to invade this field, for the purposes of prevention and protection, would be to emphasize the principle of personal service in its most ideal sense.

Our immigrant population, for the most part, come to this country to flee the cruelties of a despotic monarchy, where they are robbed of every vestige of inherent rights; where victims of monstrous injustices and atrocities, they are held in vilest subjection. They naturally look to America as the Land of the Free and the Haven of Peace. Their optimistic views are soon shattered, however, when the real situation, with the attending hardships and congestion confronts them. In the overcrowding of our densely populated districts, living in too close proximity for the necessary breathing space, where two or three families are compelled to occupy the area of one; without an available foot of ground where the children can engage in play or give vent to their inborn activities, it is little wonder that an endless amount of differences should arise. Trivial grievances are nursed, and magnified by those seeing their insults in the heat of passion. Believing, therefore, that the local stations and closely adjoining

courts, were breeding among the poorer classes useless, degrading strife; and realizing that here were fields abounding with material for preventive and constructive humanitarianism, we inaugurated some three years ago, a system that has since been adopted by social workers throughout the city. The plan to station one of our agents at the local Police Station, particularly to interview applicants for warrants and intercept litigation, met with quick response upon the part of the commanding officer, who immediately provided desk room. At the Stations last year about Five Hundred original complaints were intercepted and satisfactorily arbitrated. In almost every case, it was necessary to visit the person complained against, as well as the one making the complaint, and to bring the contending parties together, before it was possible to straighten out their difficulties. This means not only that Five Hundred persons making complaints were dissuaded from litigating, but it also means that Five Hundred prospective defendants were spared the worry and humiliation incident to arrest. In the office of the Bureau of Personal Service, Four Hundred additional cases were arbitrated, making in all Eighteen Hundred persons kept out of the Court room on original complaints. Adding only one witness to a side, the minimum number of persons turned homeward, instead of Courtward, averaged not less than Thirty-six Hundred souls. This is a very conservative estimate, as in one case alone which was arbitrated at the office, eighteen witnesses were in evidence. The next step from the Police Station, was naturally the Police Court, where an endless panorama of human misery greeted the eye day by day. Here during the course of a week, coming before the same bar of justice could be seen men and women, boys and girls of all ages and descriptions. On the one hand, there was the youth in the infancy of his criminal career, on the other hand, stood the man bowed and gray. Now the shifting scenes pictured the sturdy laborer in temporary disgrace, while beside him was the vagrant, shiftless, ambitionless—idle. The inadvertent or accidental offender, the periodically recurring violator of the law, and the habitual criminal, all formed a part of this trouble-laden, sorrowful procession. Victim and victimized met face to face, and besides all these

came a class, making one of the most pitiable pictures of human beings dehumanized—the intemperate, the debauched and the morally depraved.

Before the inauguration of the system of intercepting complaints and heading off warrants, the local Police Court had its full quota of Jewish litigants. There were days when Jews were most prominently in evidence, composing the majority of all litigants and witnesses. Today such scenes are exceptional. Judges, who formerly were incumbents of the local bench, have commented upon the very noticeable change of conditions. In the Stations, as well as in all branches of our work, arbitration is the watchword. In juvenile, family and neighborhood matters, in differences between employers and employes; in disputes on account of wages, and in almost every shade and description of domestic trouble, arbitration is effective.

It is a rule, held inviolate, except in extraordinarily extreme cases, that no complaint be acted upon, without first getting an expression from the party or parties complained against. Both sides of a case must be submitted, and only after hearing all of the evidence, is any definite action taken, or advised. In this manner, justice to all is maintained, and the judicial qualities of every worker are developed through a gradual process of experience and contact with judicial problems.

The cases handled in the Legal Aid Department of our Jewish Charities come most prominently under the following classifications:

DOMESTIC DIFFICULTY:

Cruelty in its many phases.

Immorality.

Non-Support.

Abandonment.

Separate Maintenance.

Divorce.

Bigamy.

## NEGLECT OF AND CRIMES AGAINST CHILDREN :

- Cruelty.
- Contributing to Dependency.
- Contributing to Delinquency.
- Indecent Liberties.
- Crimes against nature.
- Seduction.
- Rape.

## PETTY CRIMES :

- Disorderly conduct.
- Assault (and many others).

## FELONIES :

- Larceny.
- Confidence Game.
- Receiving stolen property.
- Embezzlement.

## CIVIL MATTERS :

- Violations of City ordinances (peddling without license and other ordinances regulating venders, and all violations of health and sanitary laws).
- Damage suits.
- Personal injury suits.
- Forcible detainer suits.
- Money claims.
- Wage claims.
- Contracts.
- Disputes involving property.
- Foreclosure suits (involving principally dealings with chattel mortgage companies).
- Insurance claims (life, fire and accident).

These enumerations include the class of cases coming repeatedly before us, in the course of our daily work, but by no means include all the classifications with which we deal.

Time will not permit of any attempt at comprehensive explanation, showing why and under what conditions charitable legal interference is permissible, ethically speaking, in the various mat-

ters here tabulated. Reference to a very few of the classifications mentioned may, however, give a slight idea of the value of legal aid. Would it be consistent with moral adjudication for instance, to permit a peddler, otherwise law-abiding and of good character, to serve time in the House of Correction because, perchance he in the face of dire poverty, felt it his duty to buy bread for his children rather than to enrich the city treasury to the extent of an exorbitant fee? Our peddlers in Chicago pay Fifty Dollars per year for a license, and now Five Dollars additional for a wheel tax. The average man cannot support his family engaged in this trade, and some time or another during the year, must have recourse to some charitable or loan organization for a temporary lift, especially during the winter season; and yet our city government insists upon collecting more than a dollar a week from his meagre earnings. That some, in a state of despair, try to take advantage of this unjust demand, cannot be wondered at. It is neither humane, nor is it consistent with public policy to allow such an offender to be forcibly placed behind bars, there to languish for weeks on account of this pardonable infraction of the law, growing out of pressing need.

It is a strange fact, however, that these comparatively innocent foreigners, guilty of minor violations, are especially pursued by the police, are harrassed and prosecuted, while those guilty of more serious offenses, are unmolested. When a man comes before the Court charged with a specific offense, the Judge, elected to enforce the law, naturally finds it more or less embarrassing to show unusual clemency, unless an appeal is made by some person in behalf of the defendant. The Social Worker finds many such opportune moments, pleading for leniency on the grounds of poverty, family distress, and obligations, and pointing out the fallacy of depriving the ordinarily law-abiding citizen of his liberty, at the expense of the administration.

Among the most pitiable appeals of complete human misery are those of the aged and infirm parents, pleading humbly for maintenance at the hands of unnatural children who have lost all trace of filial duty and affection. The display of heartlessness against those tottering close to the grave by those nearest of kin,

is so utterly un-Jewish that we would fain hide the truth from ourselves. Sad, yet true, is the fact that sons and daughters, who have reached a state of comparative comfort and affluence, are in some instances also derelict in their filial duty. For the past eight years, or more, the incumbents of the County Court of Cook County, have instructed their assistants not to start suit in Jewish cases without first referring complaints to the Bureau of Personal Service. It depends entirely upon our investigation and recommendation, whether suit is started or not. If arbitration fails then, and then only, are old parents subjected to the humiliation of facing their children in Court, in supplication for that which should voluntarily be given them. Bringing cases into the County Court is merely a matter of form, so far as most of our charitable organizations are concerned, as the order entered in any given case by the Court depends entirely upon the amount recommended by the worker making the complaint.

This same condition of affairs prevails in the Municipal and Criminal Courts, in Abandonment and Contributing Cases. The amount defendants are taxed per week, or the punishment meted out, depends almost entirely upon the facts presented by the Social Workers.

Perhaps no more helpful law, in the adjustment of neglect and non-support of children, was ever enacted in the State of Illinois, than the "Contributing Act," holding persons liable, who in any way aid, abet, connive at or assist in the conditions, which render a child dependent, neglected or delinquent. While long before this Act became a law, we were successful in collecting money from delinquent husbands and fathers, the law makes it possible to successfully reach the obdurate, who do not respond to moral suasion. At the Bureau of Personal Service, we collected last year, in small weekly payments, for the greater part, Fourteen Thousand Dollars from men who had become neglectful and indifferent to the welfare of their families. Our law now reaches a man, whether he be living at home, or apart from his family, and is, therefore, doubly effective. These cases are, as a rule, the outgrowth of utter lack of harmony in the home. Frankly speaking, back of many troubles, along the domestic difficulty line, is



vice, in one form or another, indulged in by the head of the family, such as gambling, with the incident late hours, and infidelity. Nothing is left undone to effect reconciliations. If temporary separation of husbands and wives is advised, or condoned, the ultimate aim is ever to unite the family, unless there are extreme and justifiable grounds for reversal of this rule.

In the Criminal Courts, the presence of the Charity Worker is also acceptable to the Judges, as well as to the public officials. The moral effect of the presence of such a worker is manifestly evident, a case assuming an entirely different aspect, when shorn of harsh legal interpretation. Among the hundreds of gross miscarriages of justice, which can be witnessed daily, one case stands out forcibly, and is typical of many others. This case portrayed conclusively the monstrous injustice of the State, in its august majesty, prosecuting an offending citizen, turning all its force and energy to punishment for crime, while providing nothing in its entire machinery with the slightest suggestion at rudimentary defense. A poor man may be accused of a crime of which he is wholly innocent. He may be apprehended and placed behind bars. The prosecuting forces, dramatic, emotional, vigorously upholding, as they deem it, the rights and the protection of all the people, array themselves against a forlorn, forsaken, penniless creature, with no attempt to present the other side of the question, or the expense of a single dollar in behalf of justice to the individual. The case referred to was that of a young man, without means, and without friends, who was charged with having stolen an overcoat, valued at Twenty Dollars, one cold winter's day. He had no police record. There was nothing in the evidence to show that he had ever committed a crime; nor that he would be dangerous to society, if at large. He was the personification of dejection and complete human misery. There was not a fellow creature anywhere about to say one word in his behalf. He was practically without defense. The prosecutor insisted upon enforcement of the law, and thus another poor creature, like the hundreds upon hundreds that came before, and have followed since, was deprived of liberty, was ruthlessly shorn of his manhood, and sent to our State Prison on an Indeter-

minate sentence. Such procedure should be condemned, and it is just here, in similar instances, and under similar conditions, that the voice of the Social Worker must be, and is heard. To send a man to the penitentiary, charged with a lesser crime, without giving him the slightest chance at reformation, is not only illogical and brutal, but it is a rude set-back to the advancement of a better society. Had a representative of any uplift organization been identified with the case, the young man would have been saved from a felon's fate, and would have been given an opportunity at rehabilitation and reform. His manhood would have been conserved and courage and ambition kept alive. For it must be conceded, if there is hope of redemption, such redemption must come before, not after, the prison doors have sounded the death knell to manhood; not after the prison influence has left its degrading, hardening imprint.

The Criminal Court work is so interwoven with the work in Correctional and Penal Institutions, that the Social Worker, in order to manipulate thoroughly and successfully, must follow the individual from the Court to the Prison; from Prison to freedom, and start the campaign of helpfulness all over again.

Particularly significant in the matter of protecting the rights and the liberty of individuals against injustice and intrigue, are the cases requiring legal interference on the part of Social Workers in the Insane Courts.

The beginning of this year, a plan for systematic protection of all poor, helpless insane persons, was established, with the cooperation of the alienist in charge of the Detention Hospital, where patients are held pending the hearing of their cases. We now are informed of every Jewish patient, admitted to the Hospital, or whose matter is to be heard in Court. An investigation is then made, and our representative is in Court once a week, when all insane cases are disposed of, to make recommendations in the interest of those needing protection. Startling revelations came to light of attempts by scheming husbands and other relatives, to send poor, defenceless women to Insane Asylums. Conditions here not only warranted charitable legal interference, but we felt that to withhold it, would be brutal. The following case

is typical of many others that come to the notice of charitable organizations from time to time:

Mrs. B., a delicate little woman of about fifty years, was sent to the Detention Hospital on a petition sworn to by her husband. He charged her with throwing dishes at him, giving way to uncontrollable bursts of temper, and of accusing him falsely with consorting with women of questionable character. As a victim of such delusional insanity, the man claimed that his wife was unsafe as a member of his family, and that his life was in jeopardy. There were five children in this family, between the ages of twelve and twenty-two years. Each and every child firmly and unflinchingly championed the cause of the mother, denouncing the father as brutal and inhuman. The nurse in charge of this patient at the Detention Hospital, said the latter was so completely covered with bruises when brought into the receiving ward, that she took an inventory of such bruises as a matter of record.

Our investigation of this case, showed the woman to be perfectly sane, and that the so-called hallucinations were absolute facts. The man was an almost daily frequenter of a resort in the red-light district. He remained away from home for two days at a time, and forced the support of the children virtually upon the shoulder of the wife, who was compelled to run their business. Upon recommendation of our office, the woman was released in our care; the man was forced to leave the house, and in place of separate maintenance, which could never have been collected, the business and all household effects were turned over to the wife. A few days after the hearing, the Judge expressed his opinion freely, stating what a relief and help it was to have Social Workers in his court, and how materially it helped the Court in giving maligned persons the benefit of the doubt. He also stated that there were many cases, where commitment to an institution might be averted, if kindly disposed persons were ready to assume the responsibility of adjusting domestic and family difficulties, where drastic action was not warranted by the Court, or where the Court had reason to doubt statements made by witnesses.

In the name of justice and humanity, and in order to suppress the evil features mentioned, we deemed it vital to establish the system as outlined.

Personal Injury claims are successfully handled, especially for persons receiving aid from the Relief Department, or for those who are prospective applicants, where the need for relief is forestalled by timely legal aid. With the deplorable team work of conscienceless physicians and unscrupulous lawyers, known as ambulance chasers, at the bedside of the injured patients, when the first agony pain is still upon them, there is great need for reputable advice and quick manipulation. The following case will give a slight idea of the value of friendly legal aid in straightening out the difficulties common to the poor in this class of complaints: A man of very slender means, met with a street car accident, was laid off for months, and became involved in debts of all sorts incident to running a little home. The landlord and tradespeople were pushing him for settlement. After waiting in vain for months, hoping against hope that his professional advisers would come to some definite understanding with the Car Company, he grew impatient, settling his case direct with the Company. Thereupon he was immediately sued, judgment being rendered against him, amounting to Three Hundred and Seventy-five Dollars, which amount was Seventy-five Dollars in excess of the amount of damages collected. In despair, the man came to the office. He wanted to settle his debts and reimburse the kind neighbors who had come to his assistance, and through whom he was practically maintained while ill. We succeeded in having the judgment in this matter satisfied for Fifty Dollars, allowing one-half of this amount for medical and the other half for legal services. The party sustaining the injury was not forced upon the community for care and he was in a position to square himself with his tradespeople. The judgment rendered by our legal machinery, was excessive and entirely out of proportion to the services given.

In the matter of wages, the majority of the claims are so small that suing is out of the question, the costs and lawyers' fees being ordinarily greatly in excess of the amounts due. The honest work-

man, doing his duty by his employer and his family, is entitled to his wages. Differences between a workman and his foreman, or another fellow worker, occupying a superior position, often result in the withholding of wages without the direct knowledge of the member or members of a firm. While these claims entail considerable work, they are entirely reasonable and legitimate. To aid a fellow creature in getting what is justly his, is not charity. It is an act of friendly service to which any stranger within our reach is entitled.

The ramifications of legal aid which, properly speaking, is personal service legalized, are more far reaching and complex than can possibly be evident to the casual observer. The distant lines of usefulness to the needy, and those of small means, cover the many problems involved in the mal-adjustment of human affairs of the mental rather than the physical type.

There is in this great land of ours, a law that binds together in common sympathy the people of all nations, in every condition and walk of life; a law that knows no distinction of race, creed or color; that emphasizes the bond of universal brotherhood, and that is the law of common humanity, where heart and head work together for the good of all men. In the Police Courts particularly, where those of means and culture seldom enter, for this Court is as a rule, the poor man's Court, charitable legal aid is vital.

To the Social Worker every legal proposition, coming within her scope, presents a dual outlook. Prompted by humane impulse, with her social vision pre-eminently developed, it is natural that the moral outlook should appeal to her, and that the legal aspect of a case, should be a secondary consideration only. She is deeply interested in that side of a case, which conserves the moral issue, for the moral side is positive—it is vital; while the legal side is more or less negative and traditional.

Judges cannot, without embarrassment of their own initiative, evade enforcement of the law, and pose as exponents of humanitarianism; yet they are human. They have hearts, and most of them welcome an opportunity to compromise, on the side of humanity, by making the law fit the case, instead of the case the



law. "What is meat for one is poison for another," is true in law, just as it is in the matter of physical or medical relief. Imprisonment or punishment for all offenses, is by no means a panacea against lawlessness. The Court has endless opportunities, by liberal construction of the law, to send erring men and women from the Court room to better citizenship. Rigid, arrogant adherence to the letter and not the spirit of the law, dooms many a wrongdoer to everlasting degradation—especially if he be new in the art of transgression. Nice discrimination on the side of common-sense justice, is the prerogative of every Judge dealing with the wayward classes.

I am happy to say that Social Workers in Chicago are responsible for injecting social ideas, and a humane spirit, into the Police and Court system, in place of the old-time, rigid professionalism.

It is surely significant, and a tremendous step forward towards counteracting and offsetting the glaring inconsistencies and injustices of our Court system, when Police official and Judges confer and co-operate with Social Workers for the good of the individual. It is, furthermore, significant when these officials refuse to issue complaints upon advice of the social experts, when special investigations are solicited; and when responsibility of deciding many a given matter, is placed squarely on their shoulders. A lawyer, whether criminal or civil, naturally construes the law to the advantage of his client,, appearing either negatively or affirmatively, as the case may be, for purely business reasons. Interpretations of the law are astonishingly elastic, stretching readily in the interest of a client. This is, naturally, a matter of business, and is no reflection on the legal profession. The Social Worker, on the other hand, is bound to conscience and the cause. The temptations of monetary consideration do not enter into any given case. It is quite possible, therefore, for honorable, humane adjudication, involving the merits only. One of the incumbents of our Municipal bench gave utterance to the prevailing sentiment when he said, recently, "Charitable organizations, such as we have represented in our Courts today, are not only forerunners of the Courts, but they are the left arms of the Courts as well, and their



investigations and recommendations are important in helping the Courts arrive at conscientious, impartial decisions."

The Courts appreciate the fact that the Social Workers represent the community; that they serve the community; that they do not enter a case with anything to gain or to lose; that they are disinterested; that they make thorough investigations, and after due consideration, represent the meritorious side of a controversy, from humanitarian and moral points of view, even though technically they may be weak in their conclusions.

Social service has done much to emphasize and symbolize the blessedness of Peace between families, between friends and between neighbors. Legal Social Service has brought light into the darkness of rigid, unbending, technical procedure, with its arbitrary inconsistencies and flagrant injustices. Legal Social Service has emphasized the all powerful, all vital human question, which is only too often lost in exercise of arrogant, judicial dignity. If the law be cruel and unjust towards the lowliest fellow creature, who must bend to its majesty, then it behooves us, who see and who know, to so reorganize and readjust conditions that the human equation shall come first, and the hard and fast law last. The man lives and breathes; he has a heart and a soul. The law is dead and soulless. The whole prosecuting machinery often grows hard and relentless. It is the Social Worker, whose mission it is, and shall be, to make the law serve man—not make man a slave of the law. And when I say man, it is the poor man—for him must we work and for him must we plead. The rich man laughs at the law—it may annoy him at times, but his money keeps him from being held in its painful clutches. Whether it be an evolutionary method, or a revolutionary one, the duty of the Social Worker is plain. To bring relief to the anxious mind and heart, is a necessary integral part of consistent philanthropy as a whole.

We can no longer be content to provide material relief alone. The body of the poor applicant at our doors, must be housed and fed and clothed, but cruel is the charity that sees not beyond the physical man into his heart, into his soul—and administers there to the harrowing needs. Legal Aid is personal service from

start to finish. With its far-reaching ramifications, it encompasses bar and bench, humanizing and adjusting technical legal vision; it spreads its mellowing influences into the departments of Police and Prosecutor, where brutality vitiates and stings; it enters into the barricaded walls of officialdom, and leaves its imprint there; it brings tolerance into every avenue where social duty calls; it remembers first, last and always, that there is but one all powerful consideration, and that is the living, breathing creature of the great human family—the man—the woman—the child.

### DISCUSSION.

By BERNARD GREENSFELDER,  
ST. LOUIS, MO.

The necessity of legal aid for the poor in large communities is well considered by Miss Low in her splendid paper. She has explained conditions that necessitated the Bureau of Personal Service of Chicago interesting itself in this work. The officers of the Bureau are to be congratulated upon the success attained in their community, and their efforts are worthy of emulation in all other congested districts.

The fact that co-operation has been established between the municipal authorities and the workers of the Bureau is the best indication of their success, and speaks wonders for the tact and wisdom of its officers.

The Bureau has evidently proceeded upon the theory that "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." In that it has busied itself in the affairs of the disputants before they become enmeshed in the toils of the law and the technicalities considered by the courts.

This was only possible on account of the great number of cases, and the large population in the congested district, warranting the expenditure of the necessary funds with which to secure the workers to conduct its affairs.

By this allusion I do not mean to detract from the importance or necessity of the work as carried on in Chicago, but I do want to convey the idea that such good and efficient work cannot be

carried on by volunteers alone, the reason being that the time of those engaged in this work is entirely consumed in attending to the wants of those who are being benefited by the efforts of the Bureau, and there are but few men in the profession who do not have to work for personal maintenance.

I therefore maintain, in the first place, that a paid worker, or one who can give up his entire time without compensation, is necessary in order to follow in the successful footsteps of Chicago.

In the second place, the large population of both New York and Chicago justify the establishment and maintenance of a legal aid bureau on the scale as carried out in these communities, which expenditure would not be warranted by the needs of smaller cities.

The legal aid bureau is a necessity in every community, the same as any other relief agency, but we must all realize the fact that the most effective work can only be done where it is systematized and paid for. Another cause for the success of the Bureau is the fact that Illinois is one of the first States of the Union to legislate for the improvement of the conditions of the poor and unfortunate, and for the elevation of the standards of all its citizens. Only recently, I believe, has its highest tribunal sustained the constitutionality of the law limiting the hours of labor among women.

The "Contributing Act," referred to by Miss Low, is certainly an advanced step in the matter of adopting legislation whereby the husband and father is compelled to perform the duties originally his by choice, but too often neglected after becoming the head of a family.

It is with great interest that we follow the success of the Chicago Bureau of Personal Service. I wish we could all pattern our work and efforts after this institution. It is a fact, however, that conditions in Chicago—the large population in congested districts, the systematic efforts of the paid worker, the necessary legislation and the splendid machinery of the Courts, including the new Municipal Court—all furnish the fertile soil from which the harvest is garnered.

The several large charitable associations of St. Louis have Legal Aid Bureaus, but the work is all done by volunteers, and without any attempt at organization. It seems, too, that there is not as much strife in our midst among the poor as there is in the larger towns, principally, as I believe, for the reason that our housing conditions are better, and that our people do not live in such congested quarters.

It cannot be disputed that when a great many people are compelled to live in close quarters there is bound to be trouble between the occupants thereof.

The general character of our work, with, however, the above-mentioned exception, does not differ from that of any other community.

The Legal Aid Society of the Jewish Charities of St. Louis was organized October 15, 1906. Since then it has been running systematically for nine months each year, having eight attorneys in charge, two for each of the first four evenings of the week. Since then we have handled over 2,000 cases. The nature of the cases handled were as follows:

Domestic troubles, requests for collection of wages, ejection suits, petty quarrels among neighbors and desertion cases.

The object of the Bureau is primarily to help those persons who are being imposed upon without really knowing the extent of their rights. Instead of petty affairs being carried into court, the Bureau makes an effort to settle them in the office. It has also for its object a desire to decrease litigation and strife, trickery and crime, infidelity and divorce, and encourage among the clients a mutual recognition of and regard for each other's rights, and a desire for peaceful adjustment of matters which are often pecuniary in character.

Approximately of the 2,000 cases that were handled 35% were collection of wages, 30% domestic quarrels and desertions, 15% landlord and tenant troubles and 10% petty and neighborhood quarrels and 10% other reasons.

My sole purpose in bringing out the above reference to Miss Low's report is to establish the necessity of securing the necessary legislation in every State, to bring about the creation of law

bureaus or legal aid dispensaries to be maintained and operated by the proper State or municipal authorities, to which shall be referred all the complaints of those who cannot afford to pay for legal advice.

The fact that the Juvenile Courts have been so successful in the handling of minors is my warrant and reason for believing that the law bureaus or legal aid dispensaries under State or municipal control can do as much for the elders in settling their controversies.

I believe that conditions will shape themselves along this line.

The Legislature of Colorado, at its last session, passed an act authorizing the students of law schools maintaining legal aid dispensaries to appear in court and represent litigants.

Of course, the policy of this class of legislation has been questioned, but it is believed that under a proper supervision and with the right parties in charge that great good would come therefrom.

The city of Nuremberg has established a municipal bureau for the purpose of giving free information and advice to citizens of small means who may feel that their rights and privileges are encroached upon. The bureau consists of the mayor and assistant mayor, ten legal councilors and twenty civil councilors, who appoint a committee of administration, a referee, and a bureau chief. The information to be furnished will be upon questions relating to insurance; the rights of employer and employe; police, military, school and pauper regulations; taxation, citizenship and the jurisdiction of courts dealing with punishable offenses. The chief of the bureau is required to give his good offices to bring about an agreement out of court if possible, but is enjoined from acting as attorney or bringing pressure of any sort upon either party. All officials of the bureau are forbidden to receive any fee, gratuity or gift, or to give any information or advice in cases where an attorney has already been engaged.

The New York Legislature, some months ago, appointed what is known as the Page Commission, to investigate courts of inferior jurisdiction in cities of the first class. The members of this commission have gone into the subject quite thoroughly, and if their recommendations are approved of the inferior courts in the city



of New York will be conducted on a much better basis than under the present system.

In order to protect the poor and ignorant from the lawyers who have infested these courts, the assignment is recommended to each court of a deputy assistant attorney to examine complaints, advise the prisoner whether a lawyer is necessary, or, if desirable, move the dismissal of a case. The commission also recommends the establishment of a court of domestic relation for the trial of cases of non-support by husband, parent or child.

From the cases cited, one can readily see the trend toward adopting other methods in the matter of assisting the poor in their legal difficulties. It is only a question of what is the best method to be pursued, and as the subject of legal aid is comparatively new, and social reforms are effected slowly, it will take some time until the correct system is found and adopted.

To my mind, this subject of legal aid is simply another subdivision of philanthropy, which will eventually come under the control of the State or municipality. The social worker is like a chemist in the laboratory, discovering new diseases in the body politic and finding the remedy therefor, all of which, or the majority thereof, should properly come under State control.

The few who give their time, energy and means toward alleviating the suffering and distress of the poor should not be taxed to their utmost, so the public, through taxation, should be made to assume its share of the responsibility. Of course, a great deal is to be said on both sides of this proposition, yet, when you consider the fact that cities have taken over the subject of public playgrounds, baths, legislated in reference to tenement-house conditions, as to the hours of labor for women and children, adopted manual training and established kindergartens in connection with the public school system, all of which reforms or ideas were originally suggested by the social worker, it is only a step further to take up the idea of public legal aid dispensaries, and any other new line of philanthropic work which can be carried on through public channels as well as through private sources. Some of the States now contribute toward the support of the orphan, aged and sick in private institutions. The whole matter is but a question



of education, and, as the public at large comes to realize its duties, and the different features and branches of philanthropy are brought properly to its attention, we need not fear but what the American people will do their share toward making the lot of the unfortunate as easy as possible.

I, therefore, believe it to be our purpose and duty to conduct legal aid societies in such a way, whether through public or private channels, as to give the poor man in all his difficulties, and especially when he comes into court, a "square deal."

DISCUSSION—(*Continued*).

By MAX B. MAY,  
CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Everyone interested in the subject of legal aid must be very grateful for the clear and comprehensive exposition that Miss Low has given us of this important factor in social work. Nowhere has this subject received more careful treatment, and all persons interested in this phase of charity work will be greatly helped by a careful study of the methods suggested by Miss Low. Of course, Miss Low would not expect a member of the bar to agree with her in every particular, and it might be grounds for disbarment, though I am not quite sure about this, if a lawyer were to approve and applaud her criticism of the bench and of legal administration. There is no question at all but that too much technicality has grown up in the system of administration of justice in our courts, but the remedy for this evil is with the bar itself, and it is doubtful whether criticisms on the part of lay bodies will have any influence for good in this direction.

The greatest difficulty that the worker in the department of legal aid encounters is due not so much to the ignorance of the unfortunate litigant, as to his prejudice of the legal profession, and more especially the suspicion that he has of anyone who gives him advice directly contrary to that given him by his neighbors and avaricious relatives. This is especially evident in cases of personal injury. A young boy has his hand or arm injured either through his own negligence or on account of the negligence of some fellow-servant; unfortunately, there is in force no employer's liability law, and the Supreme Court of the State in which the

injury has occurred has laid down the doctrine of contributory negligence and the fellow-servant rule. The employer carries liability insurance, and the attorneys for the insurance company collect all the evidence in the case and submit it to the attorney for the unfortunate injured party. Upon careful examination, the attorney necessarily must come to the conclusion that if an action is begun, and drags its course over a period of a few years, the Supreme Court of the State will probably ultimately hold against the injured party, and would set aside any verdict that a sympathetic jury might give him. The insurance company is willing, in order to avoid unnecessary litigation, to pay a small amount not in any way compensatory for the damage done. What should be the duty of the lawyer in charge of this case? Surely there is but one course to pursue, and that is to advise accepting the present payment of a small amount, rather than proceed with litigation, that in the end must result disastrously to the injured party. When this advice is given, in nine cases out of ten, the attorney in charge of this case is accused of selling out his client's rights. The client thinks this because his neighbors, none of whom have had any experience in matters of this kind, tell the injured party that A, B and C, who at different times were injured, recovered large sums of money, but they do not tell the injured party the circumstances of the cases that enabled A, B and C to recover. Within the past year three cases in which I advised settlements and refused to begin actions when the settlements were declined have been thrown out of court, the actions being brought by other lawyers, who were willing to risk litigating for the chance of large recoveries. Just how this evil is to be overcome it is difficult to say, and it seems quite probable that as long as human nature remains as it is the day probably will never dawn when the lawyer will not be viewed with suspicion by those who come to him for free advice, if ever by those who pay for his advice.

The Legislature of Ohio, at its session that has just adjourned, has enacted an Employer's Liability Law, by the provisions of which many injured persons will hereafter be enabled to recover damages. The principal features of the bill consist in the abolition of the strict rule of negligence of fellow-servant and assumption

of risk. Hereafter any person in the employ of such employer in any way having charge or control of any employes in any separate branch or department, shall be held to be the superior, not the fellow-servant of all employes in any other branch or department in which they are employed; any person in the employ of such employer, whose duty it is to repair, or inspect machinery, appliances or tools in any way connected with, or in any way used in the business of the employer, or to receive, give or transmit any instructions or warning to or for such employes, shall be held to be the superior and not the fellow-servant, and wherever an accident has occurred by reason of a defect or unsafe condition of any machinery or appliances, the employer shall be deemed to have had knowledge of such defect. When the fact of such defect shall be made to appear upon the trial of an action, the same shall be *prima facie* evidence of negligence on the part of such employer; but the employer may show by way of defense that such defect was not discoverable in the exercise of ordinary care. In actions for injuries the negligence of a fellow-servant of an employe shall not be a defense where the injury was in any way caused or contributed to by the defective or unsafe condition of the machinery or appliances, or the negligence of any superintendent, manager, foreman, or of any persons in any way having charge or control of the machinery or tools, or the negligence of any persons to whose order the employe was bound to conform.

In actions of this kind, whenever it shall appear that the injury was caused by the neglect of the employer to properly furnish, guard, report, inspect or protect the machinery and appliances used in the business, in the manner required by statute, and any defective or unsafe condition of such machinery or appliances, the fact that such employe continued in the employment with the knowledge of such negligent omission, or want of care, or defective or unsafe condition of the machinery, shall not be a defense, unless by the terms of his employment it was expressly provided and made the duty of such employe to report such neglect or defective or unsafe condition.

The strict rule of contributory negligence was also abolished, and hereafter, in actions for injury, the fact that the employe

may have been guilty of contributory negligence shall not bar the recovery where his contributory negligence is slight and the negligence of the employer is gross in comparison; but the damages shall be diminished by the jury in proportion to the amount of negligence attributed to such employe. This law leaves the question of contributory negligence and assumption of risk to the jury under proper instructions of the court.

In Cincinnati it has not been very difficult to conduct the legal aid department of the United Jewish Charities. The method pursued has been very simple. The superintendent of the United Jewish Charities immediately refers every case involving any kind of legal question to the legal aid department, and that department immediately begins an investigation and gives the necessary advice. In Cincinnati, of course, there are not as many cases (or as complex cases) as in a city like New York and Chicago, but the legal aid department of the United Jewish Charities has had many kinds of cases under consideration, and since the department was organized it has benefited the general administration of the Charities. This department, in addition to attending to all active litigation, advises the Charities in all legal matters—prepares the necessary affidavits for the free entry of baggage brought by the immigrants; prepares the necessary papers for the tracing of baggage that is lost in transit, and all affidavits for the necessary admission of immigrants who are detained at Ellis Island and other points of entry, until their relatives produce the necessary guarantee that they will support such immigrants.

In many cities the legal aid departments have certain office hours, especially at night, when persons can come with their grievances. In Cincinnati, however, it has not been necessary to follow such a plan, and in fact I believe that it is unwise in many respects to do so, because it merely fosters unnecessary litigation. It is needless to dwell at length upon this phase of the subject, for everyone can readily see that if persons are informed that they have the law with them in certain matters they will be most anxious to invoke the familiar phrase "I will have the law on you." There have been many cases where there have been technical violations of the rights of people, but to go to law in every such case would not only

involve useless expense and be a waste of time of the department and of the client, but the result of the litigation, even if favorable, would be of very little practical value, and I am quite sure that unless the legal aid department has at the head of it a very strong personality, which exercises influence, which a person like Miss Low can and does exercise, it is much more harmful to have the department within easy access of prospective litigants. Whenever persons needing legal advice find it impossible to come to the office of the legal aid department during the day arrangements have been made to meet such persons at the settlement building at night.

Nor has it been necessary in Cincinnati to pay particular attention to the legal work in connection with the Juvenile Court. The superintendent of the Charities, together with the probation officers under him, have been able to look after the work in this court, and whenever, in their opinion, advice of counsel was needed, of course, the legal aid department gave such advice, and attended the hearing in person.

In Cincinnati the office of the police clerk, where warrants are issued for arrests, has rendered every assistance possible to the Charities and has made it a rule not to issue warrants for frivolous causes, and in the police court the legal aid department has always received courteous treatment, and there is a harmonious working between the Charities and the police department. Under our law the Ohio Humane Society is able to render great assistance in cases of abandonment and non-support, and the legal aid department has been able to co-operate with this society in its excellent work. I believe that it is much better that the police department should pass upon the necessity of the issuance of warrants, rather than refer complaints to the legal aid department or bureau of personal service. If the latter practice is followed it will result in turning the department or bureau into a court, and necessitate that department at once taking active sides in a controversy. Thus, if by some chance a meritorious case is turned down it would tend to lessen the influence that the department or bureau would have. Of course, I am giving the result of experience in a city like Cincinnati, and it is quite possible that a different condition of affairs might necessitate the course as outlined in the paper of Miss Low.



I cannot, however, agree with Miss Low in her conclusion regarding the duty of the legal aid department where unfortunate persons have violated ordinances regarding peddlers, etc. If such ordinance works a hardship it should be the duty of the charitable organizations to have it modified, and if it cannot be modified it should be the duty of the society to advance the money to pay such license, but I cannot conceive of any conditions of affairs that would justify the violation of any ordinance, no matter how severe its provisions.

The legal aid department of the charities has also paid no attention to the question of naturalization of citizens. This excellent work is under the immediate charge of the Jewish settlement, which is a part of the United Jewish Charities of Cincinnati, and is conducted by some young lawyers who prepare the necessary papers and conduct classes in which the constitutions of the country and of the State are studied, and I would suggest that the legal aid department in other cities, if they have not already done so, should suggest to the settlement in their respective cities to do similar work.

During the past year the legal aid department of the United Jewish Charities has had before it cases of divorce, bigamy, ejection, forcible entry and detainer, innumerable personal injury cases, cases of disorderly conduct in the police court, false pretenses, recovery of money advanced to parties, who, it was afterwards learned, were well able to pay; securing alimony for persons who had been divorced; where service was had by publication, and bastardy cases.

Quite recently the legal aid department has appeared to uphold the validity of the new tenement-house ordinance, which was adopted within the past year.

Legal aid is undoubtedly a necessary part of modern charity work, and there can be no doubt that in all large cities effort should be made to organize in connection with the charities such department. If in every city there could be found as efficient people as Miss Low to head these departments much good would be accomplished and much evil averted.



DISCUSSION—(*Continued*).

By MAX HERZBERG.

President United Hebrew Charities,

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

I think the paper of Miss Low has amply justified the necessity for the erection and existence of a Legal Aid Bureau in every large community. Such a Bureau is of as much importance in the work of social service as a medical dispensary. Like the medical dispensary, however, its operations ought to be limited and restricted to such persons as actually stand in need of its ministrations. A dispensary is overburdened with malingerers, and a Legal Aid Bureau is apt to be bothered with persons having imaginary or trivial complaints, and who only apply because advice is free. In a large community there must be many people who need competent legal advice and are unable to pay for the same, but the operations of a bureau should be restricted to cases of domestic relations and certain classes of contracts, mostly those involving wage claims. I think it would be a mistake for a bureau to interfere in criminal actions or in negligence cases. One of the best results that the bureau in Chicago has accomplished is purely negative—that is, discouraging litigation. Those of us who practice law in large communities know how persistently the recently arrived immigrants will haunt our police courts. It may be that they have so long been denied justice in the courts of Russia and Eastern Europe that they overestimate its value when they come here and eagerly seek it in our courts. The Jew is tenacious, he insists upon his rights, he usually wants everything that belongs to him, and, unfortunately, he unduly manifests that characteristic in the criminal courts. In the large cities these courts are crowded with innumerable petty cases, principally assault and battery, cases that should have been settled in the minor police courts by the infliction of fines. In communities where officials are paid by fees we very frequently find that they encourage and foster litigation amongst the immigrants. Those living in crowded tenements in the congested sections of the cities are very likely to have trivial quarrels with their neighbors, and redress is sought immediately from the magistrate. Charges of assault

and battery are made, counter charges entered, and from these will grow conspiracy, perjury and various other charges. All the machinery of justice is invoked in cases which ought never to get past a magistrate's office. It is in the work of discouraging such litigation that a Legal Aid Bureau could render effective assistance. It is more important to keep people out of court than to encourage or assist them in the prosecution or defense of what are mostly trivial cases. It is very frequently the best advice and the best assistance to induce an applicant to abandon what may be a just claim involving a small amount.

MRS. HENRY SOLOMON, Chicago: I just wish to say a word about the experiences in our Legal Aid work—experiences which would bear out Miss Low's statements. The men in the district of the Bureau are far more afraid of the representatives of our Society than they are the magistrate, for they know positively that their offenses will not be condoned, and that our influence and work are not to be easily overcome. We certainly take sides, though we act as a court, and we can point to our records to show that we never lost a case. We can do work which lawyers could not in the ordinary channels of litigation.

One fact must not be overlooked—that matters for adjustment are often brought, which, by arranging directly with the judge, can be kept out of court altogether. For the judges listen carefully to representatives of the poor, who have nothing at stake of personal interest, and many times cases that come up in court are referred to us for settlement. A great deal of litigation is avoided. The amount of money which can be saved the charities, by collecting for families who would otherwise be upon the relief books, is triple the amount such a Bureau costs.

VICE-PRESIDENT MARKS: We shall now hear from Miss Low in rebuttal.

MISS LOW: I have nothing further of importance to say on the subject of "Legal Aid," but want to refer for a moment to the question of desertion, discussed this morning. Ten years ago we discussed this question at the National Conference of Jewish Charities in Chicago, and today we are still talking about it. Upon

retrospection, what have we done to suppress this ever-growing evil? We are about to present a resolution this evening, which we hope will be the means of stirring social workers to action. We advise that a permanent committee on desertion be appointed by the National Conference of Jewish Charities, and that the National Conference of Charities and Corrections be asked to appoint a similar committee, and that the two Conferences work jointly in doing something definite.

If every State in the Union would work upon a similar plan simultaneously, by getting such interests together as the Governors, the prominent prosecutors and police officials, the judges and the social workers, and agree upon some definite plan of procedure, results would doubtless follow. In order to have the means with which to extradite, we must have the sympathy and support of our executive officers; for the legal manipulation we need the prosecutors and police officials; to create the proper sentiment among the people, and insure necessary care and relief of those rendered dependent, we need the social workers. Furthermore, we need the men on the bench, for without them and their co-operation our efforts would be practically in vain. In Chicago we have no more helpful, no more co-operative or humanitarian body than the men on the bench. After getting the various bodies mentioned interested, each State ought to call a convention within its borders, study its own problem, and confer with all other States for concerted action. We all, I am sure, believe in the dynamic force of concerted action, and it is only by uniting and making desertion a national issue that we will ever accomplish anything worth while.

#### BUSINESS SESSION.

VICE-PRESIDENT MARKS: We will now have a report from the Treasurer. (For report see page 298.)

VICE-PRESIDENT MARKS: You have heard the report of the Treasurer. If there be no objections, the same will be received and made a part of the record.

Now the Committee on Resolutions.

MR. MAX HERZBERG, Chairman of Committee: Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Resolutions begs leave to present a number of resolutions, and ask that they be acted upon *seriatim*. I present the following:

*Resolved*, That the National Conference of Jewish Charities in the United States, at its biennial session, held in the city of St. Louis, Mo., on May 18, 1910, endorse the provisions of the Owen Bill for the establishment of a National Bureau of Health, and urge upon the respective members of Congress to vote for the passage of the bill; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Conference be authorized to communicate with the committee having the bill in charge, informing it of this action.

VICE-PRESIDENT MARKS: The question is upon the adoption of the resolution.

It was then duly moved and seconded that the resolution be adopted.

The question was then put by Vice-President Marks, and the motion to adopt the resolution announced carried.

WHEREAS, Numerous appeals are being constantly made to the Jews of the United States in behalf of charitable institutions in Jerusalem, and there is no available information as to whether such institutions are worthy of assistance, and it has been asserted that many of said appeals are fraudulent;

*Resolved*, That the Executive Committee be authorized to cause an investigation to be made as to the needs and requirements of such institutions, the financial support that they receive, the expenses of such appeals and returns thereto, and such other data from which a proper estimate can be made with authority to pay for the necessary costs of such investigation, and to publish a summary thereof with such recommendations as the Executive Committee may deem proper.

VICE-PRESIDENT MARKS: The question is upon the adoption of the resolution.

It was moved and seconded that the resolution be adopted.

Motion put and carried.

WHEREAS, Industrial accidents are a large contributing cause of distress among the Jewish poor, of whom a very large proportion are engaged in manual labor;

*Resolved*, That this Conference urge its constituent societies to promote, so far as they are able, the passage of laws for the compulsory payment of damages resulting from industrial accidents, eliminating the defenses of contributory negligence or the negligence of fellow-servants.

It was duly moved and seconded that the resolution be adopted.

Motion put and carried.

The admirable paper of Dr. Waldman has demonstrated the advisability of securing further data on the question of family desertion, and of devising some remedies to check an evil that has become national in its character, regardless of race or creed; therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the President of the National Conference of Jewish Charities be instructed to appoint a special committee of five to consider the question in all its phases, to prepare uniform forms for investigation and report, and to invite suggestions for remedies; which committee shall report to the Executive Committee of the Conference, who are hereby authorized and empowered to take such action as the committee may deem necessary and appropriate; and further be it

*Resolved*, That this Conference request the National Conference of Charities and Corrections to appoint a committee upon the same subject, with which this committee of this Conference may act for the purpose of securing uniform legislation throughout the United States and to enlist the sympathetic co-operation of the various authorities throughout the State in the work of remedial legislation and the prompt and efficient execution of the laws now in force or hereafter be adopted.

It was moved and seconded that the resolution be adopted.

Motion put and carried.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS: Mr. Chairman, the transportation rules which have been suggested by Judge Mack have nevertheless been criticised to some extent. We therefore offer the following resolution:



*Resolved*, That the President appoint a committee of three to consider and prepare a revision of the transportation rules of the Conference, to be submitted to the Executive Committee, which is hereby authorized to alter or adopt new rules on the subject, which, when so approved and due notice given, shall be binding on all the constituent members of the Conference.

Moved and seconded to adopt the resolution.

Motion put and carried.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS: The Committee also offers the following amendment to Section 2 of the Constitution, in reference to the payment of dues:

*Resolved*, That the Annual Membership Dues in a city where Federation exists shall be for such Federation one per cent. (1%) of the annual amount expended by it for its corporate purposes during the preceding year; not less, however, than five dollars (\$5.00), nor more than fifty dollars (\$50.00); and dues of five dollars (\$5.00) for any constituent member of such Federation that shall desire membership in this Conference.

In cities where no Federation exists, the annual membership dues for each society shall be five dollars (\$5.00) where its expenditures as above are less than five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00) and ten dollars (\$10.00) for all others.

Motion put and carried.

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS: Now, Mr. Chairman, I take great pleasure in offering the following resolution:

*Resolved*, That the thanks of the members of this Conference are tendered to the Jewish citizens of St. Louis for the generous hospitality extended by them; to the Columbian Club for the use of its beautiful edifice; to the press of St. Louis and the Jewish press of the country for the publicity given to the affairs of this body; and particularly to the Committee on Arrangements for the thoughtful and considerate preparations made for the sessions of the Conference.

Moved and seconded that the resolution be adopted by a standing vote.



VICE-PRESIDENT MARKS: It has been moved and seconded that this resolution be adopted by a standing vote. Those in favor of the motion will please arise. It is unanimously adopted.

The next will be the report of the Committee on Nominations.

The Chairman of the Committee on Nominations hereupon presented a report naming Mr. Julius Rosenwald for President, but he found it impossible to accept the honor. The following nominations were then submitted:

President, Lee K. Frankel, New York, N. Y.

Vice-Presidents, Julius Rosenwald, Chicago, Ill.; Sidney E. Pritz, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Treasurer, Bernard Greensfelder, St. Louis, Mo.

Secretary, Louis H. Levin, Baltimore, Md.

Executive Committee, Max Senior, Cincinnati, Ohio; Max Herzberg, Philadelphia, Pa.; Julian W. Mack, Chicago, Ill.; Nathan Bijur, New York, N. Y.; Jacob H. Hollander, Baltimore, Md.; Samuel S. Fleisher, Philadelphia, Pa.; Alfred Benjamin, Kansas City, Mo.; Minnie F. Low, Chicago, Ill.; Aaron Waldheim, St. Louis, Mo.; Jonas Weil, Minneapolis, Minn.

VICE-PRESIDENT MARKS: There being no other nominations, I hereby duly declare, upon the authority of a motion just carried to that effect, the nominees elected as put in nomination by the committee.

VICE-PRESIDENT ROSENWALD (assuming the chair): Have you any motions?

Moved and seconded to adjourn.

VICE-PRESIDENT ROSENWALD: If there are no objections the meeting will stand adjourned.

## SECTION OF SOCIAL WORKERS

---

Thursday, May 19, 1910.

### MORNING SESSION.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Morris D. Waldman, of New York, in the absence of Dr. L. B. Bernstein, the regular chairman for the meeting, and he announced that the chair would be taken by S. Wolfenstein, of Cleveland, O. He regretted to say that Dr. Bernstein was unavoidably detained by sickness.

CHAIRMAN WOLFENSTEIN: I have been requested to preside at this Conference this morning, and I can only express my regret at the absence of the President of this organization.

The first on the program this morning is a paper, entitled "A Special Study of the Problem of Boarding out Jewish Children and of Pensioning Widowed Mothers."

The paper was to be read by Mr. Lowenstein, but he is absent, and I understand that Mr. Bressler will read the paper.

### A STUDY OF THE PROBLEM OF BOARDING OUT JEWISH CHILDREN AND OF PENSIONING WIDOWED MOTHERS.

Based upon the work of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum and the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society of New York City in boarding out, and of the co-operative work of these two Orphan Asylums and the United Hebrew Charities in subsidizing widowed mothers.

By SOLOMON LOWENSTEIN,  
Superintendent of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum,  
NEW YORK, N. Y.

[Owing to his absence from the sessions of the Conference, the writer of the paper desires to state that it is not, in any fair sense, to be considered a committee report, but rather an expression of individual judgment. Owing to Dr. Bernstein's serious illness, no

attempt was made to have any committee meeting at which the subject could be discussed or a plan of treatment worked out. Apart from the statements of fact, contained in the statistical portions of the paper, which were based upon the replies received to the questionnaire, the writer alone must be held responsible.]

This paper does not aim to be a final statement of the questions at issue. It pretends to be nothing more than an introductory investigation, preliminary to a thorough discussion of the various problems involved. Despite the attacks that, at various times, have been made upon the institutional method of caring for children, we may assume that, at this Jewish Conference, there will be general agreement, irrespective of personal preference, in the statement that the majority of Jewish children requiring public care will, for a long time, be cared for in institutions, and that it is, therefore, our duty to maintain our institutions at the high plane of efficiency which they have hitherto occupied, and to adapt to their various needs all progressive improvements in institutional management. The institutional end of this discussion may, therefore, be passed without further comment.

Two other methods of treatment of dependent children have, however, been advocated, both in this Conference and in other forums of philanthropic discussion, culminating in the Conference on Child-caring, called by ex-President Roosevelt, in Washington, in January, 1909. The boarding of dependent children in private homes and the pensioning of mothers to enable them to maintain their children at home, after the father's death, were both advocated by this Conference, and in New York City, during the past year, a new organization has been formed for the specific purpose of attempting this latter work.

Among Jewish child-caring institutions, the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, succeeding to the work of the Joint Committee on Dependent Children of New York City (which work has been discussed at our Philadelphia Conference in 1906), and the Hebrew Orphan Asylum, starting somewhat later, have both organized and conducted for several years bureaus for placing children in board. The Hebrew Orphan Asylum, for several years, and the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, during the past year, have

likewise assisted in the care of dependent children in their mothers' homes, spending for this purpose sums approximating \$30,000 and \$3,000 annually. The work of these two organizations, in this department, has been performed largely in co-operation with the United Hebrew Charities of New York City—a rough division of the work, describing it with fair accuracy, involving the payment of rent and the furnishing of clothing and fuel by the Charities and the granting of an allowance for living expenses, to supplement the Charities' pension, and any internal resources of the family, by the child-caring institutions.

With this brief introduction, we may proceed to an examination of the work performed in the two classes:

#### BOARDING OUT.

It may be in order to state, first, the methods employed in this work. Homes are secured, primarily, in response to advertisements in the daily newspapers—English, German and Yiddish. Families are referred to the institution from various private sources; for example, by lodges, charitable individuals and families already having children in board. All such applications are carefully investigated by a special agent, giving his entire time to this work. This results in the rejection of the overwhelming majority of the applications received. During the past fiscal year 50 of 148 applications were accepted by the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society; 80 out of 603 by the Hebrew Orphan Asylum. In addition to the inspection by the institutions, all homes, found satisfactory by them, must be reported to the Board of Health of the City of New York, which rigorously investigates and determines whether the home is satisfactory for the placement of children and, at the same time, limits the number that may be so placed, in accordance with the size of the rooms, sanitary accommodations, number of persons in applicant's family and character of furniture. No children are ever boarded by either institution until the Board of Health permit has been secured. Speaking for the Hebrew Orphan Asylum, I may state, in this connection, that no home, recommended by our inspector, has ever been rejected by the Board of Health, and I am confident that a similar assertion

might be made on behalf of the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society.

It is required that, in all cases, the family applying shall have sources of income other than that received for the care of children. All applicants must furnish at least five references, not related to them, who must testify in writing, on supplied forms, to a list of questions, designed to secure information as to the financial, social, religious and moral responsibility of the persons applying for the care of children. Children are placed in Jewish families only, and never in families where there are small children who will require the attention of the mother and divert it from the boarded children.

All boarded children attend the public schools, and report cards of their progress must be shown to the investigator of the institution each month, when issued. Children in board are entered at the nearest religious school, when there is one at an accessible distance. In a number of instances special payments are made for this purpose.

The health of the children is carefully supervised by means of regular examinations by the institutional physicians and, in the case of the children placed by the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, by a visiting nurse. All children are regularly weighed and measured and, naturally, receive special treatment in cases of acute illness.

All clothing is furnished by the institutions and, likewise, all incidental expenses, apart from board, are met.

This work is supervised by the State Board of Charities, which, in New York State, is a very efficient body. Boarding homes are visited and office records examined by a special investigator of the State Board of Charities. During the past year the work of both institutions in this department has been placed in Class I, the highest rating of the State Board. In view of the fact that some of the most efficient agencies for placing children have their headquarters in New York City, this rating is a source of just pride to the institutions.

In order that the work of supervision may be thoroughgoing additional investigators are employed for this purpose, who investigate and visit the homes in which children have been placed

at least once a month in all cases, and in many cases semi-monthly. The children themselves make frequent visits to the institution for the purposes of obtaining clothing, to have shoes repaired, to visit the physician and to be advised concerning their work in school, when this is necessary. They are thus under constant observation, and are free to report concerning their homes, so that whenever it appears advisable children may be transferred to another home in case the one already found should for any reason prove undesirable. Statistics of the work conducted by the two institutions at the present time are as follows:

	Hebrew Orphan Asylum.		Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society.
Number of children in board at the present time.....	Boys	138	
	Girls	119	
		— 257	251
Number of children discharged during present year.....	Boys	70	
	Girls	54	
		— 124	200
Total number of boarding homes at the present time..		135	150
Geographical distribution of these homes:			
East Side to 100th Street.		19	44
Harlem.....	East	33	
	West	21	
		— 54	35
Washington Heights and Upper West Side.....		10	16
Bronx.....		35	35
Brooklyn.....		7	14
Suburban and country homes.....		10	6
		— 135	— 150
Amount spent on boarding de- partment during the past year.....		\$25,694.36	\$36,402.91

During the past year an attack upon the work of boarding out Jewish children in New York City was made by Dr. S. Wolfenstein, of the Cleveland Orphan Asylum, after a visit to New York and an investigation of a few homes. We believe, with all due respect to Dr. Wolfenstein's judgment, that he was grossly mis-



taken in his estimate of this work. In connection with this report an independent investigation of homes in which children have been placed by the two institutions was made by Messrs. M. D. Waldman, of the United Hebrew Charities of New York City, and D. M. Bressler, of the Industrial Removal Office. These gentlemen visited homes of their own selection in various parts of the city. No notification of these visits had been given to the boarding mothers, and the homes were visited by them under the same conditions as those in which they were accessible to Dr. Wolfenstein, to whom likewise a full list of the homes of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum had been furnished upon his visit to New York. The writer does not believe that he can enter, with any impartiality, into this discussion, and he prefers, therefore, to leave this matter to be presented to the Conference by the two gentlemen mentioned, as part of the discussion upon this paper.

I would, however, present the following points in resumé of this portion of the topic. The children placed in good boarding homes receive, in general, more individual attention and, in the great majority of cases, more individual affection than is possible in the best institution. They are kept clean, both as regards their bodies and their clothing. They live in a type of home far better, in most instances, than those from which they had been taken, and as good as those occupied by the great majority of the self-respecting, independent working class of New York's Jewish population. They are living, some of them, in the far better neighborhoods of New York; most in the newer parts of the city, and many in houses of a type of construction definitely better than were the homes of New York's Jewish population at a time when the present generation of well-to-do Jews of New York were children. There need be no fear that these children are being placed in improper homes. It is true that, at times, the right personal adjustment is not always secured at the first placement, and subsequent transfers may be necessary. In other cases women, whose homes have been found satisfactory, have proved unsatisfactory because of personal characteristics, which make them ineligible to continue in charge of children. Such homes must be abandoned, but the percentage of such failures is small and does not militate against the general

value of this method of care. But, beyond such general argument in its favor as a means of caring for all kinds of children that come to us, we may definitely assert that it has decided advantages over the institutional method in at least three classes of cases:

First—The child, under seven or eight years of age, really has no proper place in a large congregate institution. Such children thrive much better, both physically and mentally, in the small private home, and should be boarded out, whenever possible.

Second—Every institution has its share of children who are abnormal or atypical, either socially or intellectually. They may be unduly precocious or abnormally dull, without having sunk to the level of feeble-mindedness. They may be unfit, by reason of undue timidity or undue assertiveness, for life in the crowded institutional ranks. The well-selected boarding home is far better than the institution for such cases.

Third—The class of physical defectives; children having heart trouble, crippled children or those suffering from any other physical ailment, requiring hospital treatment, are ineligible for admission to most institutions, but can easily be cared for in a good private home.

For another class the boarding home is often preferable. I refer to those half-orphans, who are motherless. The father is often able and anxious to live with his children, and very often the boarding home provides this means. Often, though the father cannot live in the same home with his children, the boarding home is, in many instances, preferred by him because of the frequency with which he may visit the children and the oversight that he can bestow upon them. The Hebrew Orphan Asylum makes it a rule never to place fatherless half-orphans in board unless the mother is incapable of caring for her own children by reason of physical or moral disqualifications.

The one great question that the boarding-out system has yet to answer and which, at least in the case of the Jewish institution, it cannot yet answer because of its comparative newness, is what effect will it have upon the children as they become older, and what can it give in the way of future training. With regard to the latter, I see no reason why the institution cannot give its

boarding-out children the same advantages as it offers to those brought up within its walls. The answer to the former is more dubious, and can be determined only when the future shall have given us more material upon which to base our judgment.

#### PENSIONING OF WIDOWS.

\*To enable the investigation to proceed upon some lines of definite information it was decided that, for the purpose of this work, 100 cases should be chosen, distributed as follows: United Hebrew Charities, 45 cases; Hebrew Orphan Asylum, 45 cases; Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, 10 cases. It was the original intention that the cases of the United Hebrew Charities should be such as received assistance from no other organization. A few cases, however, were submitted in which additional assistance was given, but not in sufficient numbers to change the general result of the examination. Both the Orphan Asylum and the Sheltering Guardian cases are necessarily those in which the United Hebrew Charities co-operated. To secure uniform results a list of questions was prepared, and each of the three organizations was to have answered upon blanks made in this fashion. The 10 Sheltering Guardian Society cases, however, were not reported in accordance with this method and the results in these cases are, therefore, not absolutely uniform. The differences, however, are not in essential matters. The following is a copy of the items of information requested with relation to each case:

- Name of family?
- Address?
- Number of rooms occupied?
- Number of windows per room?
- Number of beds, cots or other articles used for sleeping purposes?
- Has the apartment a private toilet?                      A private bathroom?

\*One Hebrew Orphan Asylum reply has been lost. Its figures, therefore, treat of only forty-four cases, reducing the total number considered to ninety-nine. The Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society cases are, of course, too few in number to permit of any general conclusions being drawn from their figures alone.

Is it an old or new style tenement?

What uses are made of the various rooms?

Amount of rent paid?

Is the head of the family a widow or a deserted woman?

Number of persons in family—

(a) Adults? Married? Single?

(b) Children above working age?

(c) Children below working age, but of school age?

(d) Children below school age?

Are there boarders or lodgers in the family? If so, what amount do they pay?

Does the mother perform other work than household duties? If so, what, and how much does she earn?

Occupations and wages of working members of the family?

Are there any physical defects in any members of the family?

Is there any chronic disease in any member of the family, particularly tuberculosis, and, if so, what attention is given to invalid?

Do the children attend school regularly?

What educational training do the children receive outside of public school, viz., in religious schools, settlements, etc?

How do the children spend their time outside of school, particularly on Saturday and Sunday?

What are their means of recreation; theatre, settlement clubs or classes, moving picture shows, street play, etc.?

Have any of the children ever been arrested? If so, for what?

Are any of the children away from home; in institutions and otherwise? If so, why and where?

What charitable assistance has the family received? Include under this all forms of assistance, whether from public or private sources; whether in cash, coal or supplies.

The information secured from the analysis of the replies thus received shows the following results:

U. H. C.	H. O. A.	H. S. G. S.
NUMBER OF CASES.		
45	44	10
LOCATION.		
45 downtown	24 downtown 20 uptown	10 downtown
HEAD OF FAMILY.		
34 widows 11 deserted women	33 widows 9 deserted women 2 cases—husband living (1 insane; 1 blind)	10 widows
SIZE OF HOMES AND FAMILIES.		
	<i>1 family 5 rooms.</i>	
	1 family 8 persons	
<i>5 families 4 rooms.</i>	<i>16 families 4 rooms.</i>	
1 family 10 persons	1 family 10 persons	
1 family 6 persons	2 families 9 persons	
1 family 4 persons	1 family 8 persons	
2 families 3 persons	5 families 7 persons	
	3 families 6 persons	
26 persons	2 families 5 persons	
average per room 1.3	2 families 4 persons	
	107 persons	
	average per room 1.6+	
<i>22 families 3 rooms.</i>	<i>19 families 3 rooms.</i>	<i>7 families 3 rooms.</i>
1 family 12 persons	1 family 9 persons	1 family 9 persons
1 family 8 persons	4 families 7 persons	1 family 7 persons
5 families 7 persons	3 families 6 persons	2 families 6 persons
2 families 6 persons	6 families 5 persons	3 families 5 persons
7 families 5 persons	3 families 4 persons	
4 families 4 persons	2 families 3 persons	
2 families 3 persons		
124 persons	103 persons	43 persons
average per room 1.8+	average per room 1.8	average per room 2.0+
<i>17 families 2 rooms.</i>	<i>8 families 2 rooms.</i>	<i>3 families 2 rooms.</i>
2 families 7 persons	1 family 7 persons	2 families 6 persons
2 families 6 persons	1 family 6 persons	1 family 5 persons
1 family 5 persons	1 family 5 persons	
6 families 4 persons	3 families 4 persons	
6 families 3 persons	2 families 3 persons	
73 persons	36 persons	17 persons
average per room 2.1+	average per room 2.25	average per room 2.8+
<i>1 family 1 room.</i>		
1 family 3 persons		

## U. H. C.

## H. O. A.

## H. S. G. S.

## RENTALS.

*5 room apartments.*

5 rooms \$15.00  
average \$3.00 per room

*4 room apartments.*

1 apartment \$18.00  
1 apartment \$17.00  
1 apartment \$15.00  
1 apartment \$13.50  
1 apartment \$12.00

*4 room apartments.*

2 apartments \$17.00  
1 apartment \$16.00  
1 apartment \$15.00  
1 apartment \$14.50  
2 apartments \$14.00  
1 apartment \$13.50  
1 apartment \$13.00  
1 apartment \$12.50  
2 apartments \$12.00  
1 apartment \$11.00  
2 apartments \$10.00  
1 apartment \$ 8.00

average per room \$3.77½ average per room \$3.27½

*3 room apartments.*

1 apartment \$15.00  
1 apartment \$14.00  
3 apartments \$13.00  
2 apartments \$12.50  
3 apartments \$12.00  
1 apartment \$11.50  
6 apartments \$11.00  
5 apartments \$10.00

*3 room apartments.*

1 apartment \$13.50  
2 apartments \$13.00  
2 apartments \$12.00  
1 apartment \$11.00  
5 apartments \$10.00  
2 apartments \$ 9.50  
1 apartment \$ 9.00  
3 apartments \$ 8.00  
2 janitresses—free

*3 room apartments.*

1 apartment \$13.00  
1 apartment \$11.75  
2 apartments \$11.50  
1 apartment \$11.00  
2 apartments \$10.00

average per room \$3.88½ average per room \$3.46 average per room \$3.75

*2 room apartments.*

1 apartment \$12.00  
1 apartment \$11.00  
3 apartments \$10.00  
2 apartments \$ 9.50  
2 apartments \$ 9.00  
2 apartments \$ 8.50  
5 apartments \$ 8.00  
1 apartment \$ 7.50

*2 room apartments.*

1 apartment \$12.00  
1 apartment \$11.00  
1 apartment \$10.00  
1 apartment \$ 9.50  
2 apartments \$ 9.00  
1 apartment \$ 8.00  
1 apartment \$ 6.50

*2 room apartments.*

1 apartment \$11.00  
2 apartments \$ 9.00

average per room \$4.54½ average per room \$4.68½ average per room \$4.83½

*1 room apartment.*

1 apartment \$ 5.00

## GENERAL AVERAGE RENT PER ROOM FOR ALL CLASSES.

\$4.06 1-5

\$3.50

\$3.99

## AVERAGE RENTAL PER FAMILY.

\$12.18

\$11.20

\$10.77



## HOUSING STATISTICS.

45 families	44 families	10 families
226 persons	254 persons	60 persons
121 rooms	142 rooms	27 rooms
average persons per family 5.0+	average persons per family 5.7+	average persons per family 6.
about 2 $\frac{3}{4}$ rooms per family	3.2+rooms per family	2.7 rooms per family
1.8 persons per room	1.7+persons per room	2.2 persons per room

## FAMILY AGE STATISTICS—FAMILY CONDITIONS.

226 persons	254 persons	60 persons
58 adults	48 adults	10 adults
23 working children	34 working children	4 working children
113 children—school age	134 children—school age	28 children—school age
32 below school age	38 below school age	18 below school age

## LODGERS IN FAMILIES AND AMOUNTS PAID.

17 families with lodgers	11 families with lodgers	No lodgers
26 lodgers \$81.50	2 grandmothers	
	1 brother-in-law, \$5 mth.	
	9 lodgers \$27.00	
average \$3.13 per mth.	average \$3.00 per mth.	

## OCCUPATIONS AND EARNINGS OF MOTHERS EMPLOYED AT WORK OTHER THAN CARING FOR HOME.

28 mothers employed	20 mothers employed	2 mothers employed
14 washing	4 washing	1 washing \$1.20 per wk.
1 candy store	9 sewing	1 occasional sewing
6 meals for boarders	4 peddlers	
4 sewing	2 odd jobs	
2 odd jobs	2 janitresses	
3 peddlers	1 cooks meals	
(2 of these served meals in addition to other work)	(2 of these served meals in addition to other work)	
Earnings from \$5 to \$6 per week	Earnings from \$1 to \$6 per week	

These figures speak for themselves. With relation to the housing conditions, the following general remarks may be added:

It is impossible, in most cases, to give definite names for uses of rooms. With families of the sizes given, living in such restricted quarters, it is obvious that there can be no such thing as a room used only to receive visitors and for other family social activities. Though each family claims parlor and dining-room, wherever the number of rooms is sufficient to justify such aristocratic preten-

tions, none the less it cannot be doubted that all rooms, when the day is ended, must serve alike as sleeping quarters. The reports on the Hebrew Orphan Asylum cases indicate that, in a somewhat larger percentage than in the others, the claim was made that the kitchen was not used for sleeping purposes; all the other rooms, however, are frankly admitted to be used as bedrooms. Likewise, it is difficult to state with exactness concerning the articles used for beds. These, according to the replies, were, generally speaking, sufficient in number, but they included not only ordinary bedsteads, but folding beds, folding cots of types peculiar to New York City, couches and even chairs. In one case a mother and three children were reported as occupying one bed. Windowless rooms, one of the horrors of old-style tenements, were found in twelve United Hebrew Charities rooms and six Orphan Asylum rooms.

The following figures also relate to housing conditions:

U. H. C.	H. O. A.	H. S. G. S.
TYPE OF TENEMENT.		
10 new-style tenements	11 new-style tenements	2 new-style tenements
7 remodelled old tenements	33 old-style tenements	8 old-style tenements
28 old-style tenements		
SANITARY ACCOMMODATIONS.		
2 private toilets	17 private toilets	no dark rooms
1 private bath	6 private baths	no private toilets
		no baths

[Note in connection with these figures that, under existing regulations, no child is ever placed in a boarding home without private bath and toilet.]

It is difficult to get exact or definite statements concerning the employment of the children. Suffice it to say that those reported were employed in the usual shop, factory and office occupations, at wages ranging from \$3.00 to \$7.00 per week.

With reference to the health of the families, a number of women in each class complained of anæmia, neurasthenia, weak hearts, defective eyesight and various internal disorders, or defects of

the special senses. The only diseases present which might have possible adverse effect upon the children maintained in these homes were five cases of tuberculosis among United Hebrew Charities families, and one Hebrew Orphan Asylum case. It is interesting to note, however, that all these cases are receiving medical treatment from some form of medical charity. In no case was a private physician reported.

Recreation of the children is but ill provided for. Playing on the streets is the usual reply. Settlement clubs, when present in the neighborhood, are somewhat used, and the library is generally popular. The form of recreation most frequently mentioned is an occasional visit to the moving picture show. School attendance, in all cases, is reported as regular, with a single exception, among the United Hebrew Charities cases. Hebrew instruction is the object of much solicitude. Figures for the United Hebrew Charities, Hebrew Orphan Asylum and Sheltering Guardian Society are 28, 30 and 4 families, respectively, in which this branch receives attention, frequently at financial cost.

Delinquency is rare. Among the United Hebrew Charities cases 3 arrests are reported—1 of a husband for forgery, 1 of a boy for stealing, 1 of a boy peddling without a license. In the Hebrew Orphan Asylum cases 2 boys were arrested for peddling without licenses and 1 for jumping on a street car while in motion.

Relief statistics are as follows:

U. H. C.	H. O. A.	H. S. G. S.
Pensions.....\$554.86	U. H. C.....\$337.60	H. S. G. S.... \$178.00
Average		
per family... 12.33	H. O. A..... 595.50	U. H. C..... 108.20
Other sources... 156.00	Other sources... 31.00	Other sources. 5.00
Total asst....\$710.86	\$964.10	\$288.20
average per family about \$15.79	average per family \$21.91	average per family \$28.82
average rent per family \$10.80	average rent per family \$11.20	average rent per family \$10.77

(In all these cases clothing, fuel and Passover supplies are furnished by the United Hebrew Charities to pensioners in addition to the pension).

These figures indicate that those pensioned are not being adequately supported; that they are living in quarters congested altogether beyond the dictates of health, morality and decency; that they are being compelled to eke out a living far inferior to that required by a normal standard. The amount of relief given beyond the earnings of mothers and children, where there are any such, is, in the cases assisted by the United Hebrew Charities alone, barely sufficient to cover the rent, and, in other cases, where co-operative effort prevails, the amount of relief is very meagre, compared with the average size of the family.

This is by no means to say that the policy of attempting to maintain homes intact is unwise. Given a good mother there is no reason, as has been stated frequently on the platform of this Conference, why she should be compelled to add the distress of breaking up her home to the grief occasioned by the loss of her husband, but, if the community has wisely decided to assist her to do this, it must, at the same time, determine that its support shall be adequate. It must give generously and not with niggardly hand. The mother ought not to be compelled to engage in work that will call her away from her own home, nor be forced, in her own home, to perform so large a quantity of work as to cause her to neglect her children, nor should her work be of such character as to impair her own health or that of her offspring. Above all, the keeping of lodgers, other than those related by blood ties to the family, should be prohibited absolutely. The family should not be allowed to remain in the poorer overerowed neighborhoods of the city, but inasmuch as, in most cases, the majority of the children are below the legal working age, they should be required to move out into suburban or less closely settled neighborhoods, where the opportunities for fresh air and healthful play are unrestricted. The relief granted should be sufficient to enable the child, in addition to remaining at home, to have at least a fair share of the recreative opportunities that are afforded to his fellow in the institution. But, for the proper working out of this class of cases, a much greater degree of supervision must be provided than is furnished by any of the existing New York agencies. This is not work for the salaried employe. It is pre-eminently the task of the friendly

visitor; of the good woman who feels that in large organized charity there is no place provided for her personal service. Too often the mother is not competent to spend wisely the amount of money that may be necessary to give her adequate relief. The friendly visitor, sympathetic, tactful, with a knowledge of good housekeeping, can be of invaluable service to her. In addition to assisting in the expenditure of funds and the management of the family budget, she may find work to do in advice concerning the preparation of foods and the foods to be used; the cleanliness of the children, their schooling and amusement. With proper supervision, I believe this kind of work can become extremely valuable; without it, I am convinced that it can result only in failure.

CHAIRMAN WOLFENSTEIN: According to the program, you will notice that I was to discuss this paper, but I decline to do so. I received the paper yesterday, which was sent to me by mail, and I have been so busy I have just looked over it and just read it today. But even if I had had it before I would decline to discuss it here today, as long as I am now here presiding, and also I do not think I need to discuss it. I have published my views on the subject, and I think they are well known, and I have not changed them after the paper was read.

#### DISCUSSION.

By HENRY MAUSER,  
Superintendent Pacific Orphan Asylum,  
SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.

It is unfortunate that the members of the committee were not able to complete their report, and this with a more complete decision of the members of the committee.

The paper presented here this morning is to some extent contradictory, and practically places in the hands of its opponents the weapons of argument.

The idea of placing out our children to board is not a new one; it is practically as old as civilization, but with us it dates back to to city almshouse, where peripatetic travelers would be put away,



leaving children to be taken care of by the town; and even in those days they were unable to find proper homes for these children, and they were placed in the almshouse, there to be kept until they were able to start out to work, which, in those days, was at a very youthful period, and they were made veritable slaves.

The paper presented seems to be more typical of New York City than any other place. Perhaps the congestion is so great there, the problem is so large, that other methods besides housing children in orphanages must be taken, and I grant you such children should be put in homes proper for their care.

The theory that the private home is best for the child is beyond argument. But the problem of finding practical homes is beset with great, almost insurmountable, obstacles, that have not been overcome up to the present time, and the attempts so far have been merely experimental. It will take years before a definite decision as to the method can be arrived at.

I want to ask these questions: What called into being settlement work? What has called into activity the social service worker? The alleviating, the educating, the refining and the uplifting of our co-religionists who require their services?

In seeking homes for the children, to whom are you looking to place them? To whom have you looked to place the children who have been placed? Those whom you and I would like to care for our children would we pick the very class whom we are called on to educate and refine? Are those the homes in which you would place children who have already been punished by being bereft of parents? Are they who have homes and education and refinement willing to take a child? No; consequently you will have to look to the very class who require unlifting.

I claim the movement stultifies itself. If you cannot find homes with equal refinement, equally as well-equipped as a well-equipped orphan asylum, you have not found the proper solution of this problem, nor have you found the proper homes for the children.

I must approach reverently the city of New York. We who live in small communities, who have not the congestion to contend with, who have not the problems to fight against that New York has, we find that in the small institution family affection, education and



refinement and the affection between the children and those in charge can be had and is had.

In New York you have a disproportion of defective children, who are most probably detrimental to the mass of children, and for them it is absolutely necessary to find homes on the outside, and with that idea I am heartily in accord.

With reference to the question of pensioning widows, after ten years of advocacy of the cause with the board of directors of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum, they did not deem it wise to enter into that at that time, but they are on the eve of doing so.

According to another report today, which we are also discussing, you can see how difficult and enormous a task confronts us to place children even with their own mothers. How many of these women are capable of taking care of their own children and of doing for them the tithe of what is done for them in the orphan asylum? How many of these women are already the object of charity? How many of these women know how to carry on their household, much less rear children they have brought into the world?

It is a great subject, and I am heartily in favor of pensioning a widow for taking care of her children. The fact is a widow would much rather get paid for taking care of her child than to have it put out in an orphan asylum. Not only should she receive ample assistance, but every assistance that she requires.

But I think the greatest care should be taken as into whose hands the children are placed, mothers or anyone else. There is no one, I am sure, who hates more than I the idea of taking children away from their parents. But when the parent is not properly equipped that sentiment should have no place. We owe the duty not alone to the mother, but we owe the duty to the country and the community in which we live, and no sentiment should intervene to prevent us from taking the proper course to rear these children, to make them good citizens.

Now I contend that if the difficulty is so great in placing children with their own mothers, how undesirable it would be to place them with strangers if those who take them take them not because they care for them, but simply for the stipend that is given for

their care, in order to eke out their existence. For this reason a family of children can be better taken care of in institutions under wise people skilled in their care. They can receive just as much parental affection as they can from strange women, and until this question is properly adjusted, until there is the proper amount of other income to warrant these people in taking these children and educating them, and not needing the stipend for their own support, I claim those in charge of institutions should see to it that the children are placed in their institutions, where they may receive all they are entitled to, the asylum taking the place of the parents whom God has taken away from them.

DISCUSSION—(Continued).

By ARMAND WYLE,

Superintendent Jewish Orphan Asylum,

NEWARK, N. J.

Unfortunately, no copy of Mr. Lowenstein's report was received by me prior to my departure for this Conference, and only a superficial reading of it was possible when it finally reached me. The only conclusion that seems possible to be drawn from it is that the boarding-out system, described by Mr. Lowenstein as being practiced by the two New York orphan asylums, is being conducted with every possible precaution to safeguard the integrity of the children placed out by them; therefore, some generalizations made in my paper might be modified so far as these agencies are concerned. Should such care be taken by all agencies engaged in this phase of the work, no adverse comment could be entertained. However, dangers *do* exist, as under other systems, and it is with these dangers that my paper has to deal. That all methods of child-caring have their merits is *also* true, and in view of the great number of children to be considered all *tried* systems should play a complementary part in child-welfare work.

The keynote of the White House Conference on the Care of Dependent Children was expressed in these words: "Home life is the highest and finest product of civilization. Children should not be deprived of it, except for urgent and compelling reasons."

The committee on resolutions of the Conference in reporting its conclusions to President Roosevelt sounds the danger note of this

summary in recommending that prospective homes should be most carefully investigated by thoroughly competent persons, and that after placement these homes should be intelligently visited; finally, it says: "Unless and until such homes are found, the use of institutions is necessary." If this program should in all cases be carried out, it is my belief that "urgent and compelling reasons" would very often be found why children should continue to be maintained in institutions. Home life is truly the ideal one for children, but good homes are difficult to discover—homes where the standard is as high as is that demanded of institutions. The Conference also recommends State supervision of all methods of child-caring agencies, public or private. If this is done by honest and thoroughly competent persons, any method will prove effective, the community itself being the best judge of the policy to be maintained.

Mr. James E. West, Secretary of the White House Conference, in a personal letter to me stated that among 10,000 applications made to a magazine interested in home finding for children a fair proportion were found unworthy, and among the worthy ones two Jewish families were given Jewish children with unsatisfactory results. He admits the danger of exploitation, improper supervision, insufficient guardianship of health, safety, morals, religion and education, though he maintains that thousands of homes offered were found to be ideal places for children, but that institutions in our large cities are unwilling to release their children. This is in itself significant, for no institution managed on broad lines would reject such opportunities if the system were found satisfactory. Mr. West further says that some institutions are making arrangements to transfer children to the Middle West, of which he apparently approves; but Texas, for one, is remonstrating, on the ground that the shipping has been carelessly managed and the children have frequently fallen into the care of irresponsible persons. (See *New York Times*, May 2, 1910, editorial page.)

Such tests as those recently essayed in New York by Dr. Wolfenstein and the committee sent out to refute his conclusions are misleading and by no means conclusive. It is universally acknowledged that Dr. Wolfenstein has had eminent success with a con-

gregate institution for children, but this very success may, in a measure, account for his attitude toward the homes he so inauspiciously visited. (See editorial, *American Hebrew*, March 11, 1910.) On the other hand, the persons interested were aware of the intended visits of the investigating committee from the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society, and these calls were made on succeeding Saturdays, when Jewish homes are in Shabbas order and children in holiday condition and attire.

The committee above mentioned stated that the inspector made sufficiently frequent visits, this being as definite a statement of this important feature as I had seen before reading Mr. Lowenstein's report, and is decidedly inconclusive. Inspectors' visits are not in all agencies likely to be frequent, and may be controlled by personal interest, though this interest is not necessarily induced by anything more than the attractive personality of a child. The time of an inspectors' visits can easily be gauged, if they be irregular; a child may be afraid to tell of its ill treatment even if it is able to do so, or may exaggerate its wrongs; petty discrimination may be shown in favor of the family's own children and cause much misery to the others.

Now a word as to these homes. Judge William H. DeLaey, of the Washington, D. C., Juvenile Court, says that 85% of the children in court are there because of home conditions. Ernest K. Coulter, Clerk of New York Children's Court, says that he figures 101,000 rooms in Manhattan are without windows and that 300,000 persons exist in them. The New York Child Welfare Committee says there is in New York less than one square foot of playground for each child. It is estimated that 95% of the children quit school before 14 years old. Dr. Reeder says that "The attempt to escape their God-given responsibility by many parents nowadays is the chief cause of juvenile delinquency, of well-filled proteetories, reformatories and so-called industrial schools." It is among tenement homes that compulsory attendance at public school is most frequently imposed; that truant officers are oftenest seen; that the school doctor and nurse are most needed. How much more carefully can one expect foster-parents to care for children placed in their charge, than do parents for their own

flesh and blood? Will foster-parents send fewer children to make up Judge DeLacey's 85%? May some not live in a house where one or more of Mr. Coulter's 101,000 windowless rooms are located? One foot of playground per child is negligible as compared to the spacious grounds of most institutions, and is fraught with grave danger if the crossing of car tracks and automobile-driven streets to gain access to them be alone considered, to say nothing of streets and forbidden premises used as playgrounds. These homes may or may not be religious. They may or may not have any moral influence upon the children. A little girl having several times violated the sanctity of a settlement house, by swearing, was finally excluded until her father should bring her back. When they returned he was told that his little girl had sworn at a boy. "Well, it was only my brother," said she, and the father replied: "Where did you think you was—at home?" Twenty-five thousand delinquent children from private homes are in institutions. What amazement is caused by the discovery of an orphan asylum child in such an institution; it happens fortunately but in rare instances.

Over thirty years ago the society which I represent adopted the policy of placing children in private families, and with some success. In 1887, however, the trustees found it desirable to maintain an orphan asylum because of the impossibility of finding suitable homes, and today they believe as do many others, that selfish motives alone induce those families that will consent to take children for a monetary consideration, to undertake the care of them. They further believe that such families are not capable of maintaining a proper intellectual, moral or spiritual standard for these children, for they do not maintain one for their own children.

Dr. Reeder in his book, "How 200 Children Live and Learn," says: "Any need that is easily observed and apparent to everyone is pretty sure to be well looked after in children's institutions. . . . How capricious and accidental is the dietary of children in a majority of American homes. They eat anything and everything they want with little regulation as to time, quantity or quality. They sleep when nature forces it against the odds of high tension amusements of all sorts and play without leadership



or reference to what is best for the development of mind or body." This arraignment would surely include the homes where children are placed; in institutions of the better type these matters are all carefully considered.

Every institution has a competent medical staff at hand to intercept any encroachment of disease. My institution has an eye, ear, nose and throat specialist, who keeps constant watch over the children. A dentist in the neighborhood gives immediate attention to our children and examines and treats them semi-annually. The investigating committee from the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society found a number of instances in which the teeth of the children required attention. This would not be likely to happen in an institution.

We feel that in our small orphan asylum we have some advantages of the cottage system as well as the congregate, for, after all, the latter has some compensations. Besides this our society gives relief to needy families and is often able to keep the family intact by aiding the parent to help the child without having recourse to any system, the natural home being the best. If it is true as Dr. Wolfenstein suggests, that New York should have ten more small orphan asylums the inmates could be more finely classified into homogeneous groups, one of which, for instance, could be an atypical one. Furthermore, the expense of maintaining these various institutions, would be less than an adequate cottage system to care for all children in need of protection.

The best that can be said of the placing-out system is that the child may come into close contact with an attractive personality, and that is not impossible in institutions of the cottage type—or even congregate systems. The system is not so important as the director of it, though the director of a cottage system has better opportunities than the others. That instead of a Wolfenstein, a Bernstein, or a Lowenstein, we sometimes find a Frankenstein, need not disparage an entire system. New systems are not so much needed as improvements on the old, and, above all, sincere, efficient workers who look not so much for a job as for the welfare of the children with whom they come in contact.



I believe that what is possible in a poor or mediocre foster home can be attained in a good institution, and more. It has been said of the New York Orphanage that "social workers committed to the conclusion that a good home is always better than an institution, will see that homes wherein children have a better opportunity than is afforded them in such a orphanage as this are few." What can be done in an ideal home is most decidedly more than is possible in the best conducted orphan asylum that ever existed.

In conclusion, I would say that where no institution exists for their particular needs, atypical children, of all grades, may, under present conditions, be advantageously, if only temporarily, placed in boarding homes, since their presence in the institution is a menace to normal children and constitutes the so-called institutional type so rapidly disappearing from our institutions. To these I would add children under school age. For other normal children, however, in view of the dangers connected with the placing-out system, which have been indicated in this discussion, if it came to adopting this system exclusively by a new child-caring agency, as against that of the cottage or congregate plans, I would emphatically urge the adoption of the cottage system, and until the dangers of the home-finding plan are removed the congregate system can be made to serve as a fairly good alternative.

MR. WALDMAN, New York: I will ask the Chairman to let me say a word or two in explanation of any possible misunderstanding. When Dr. Wolfenstein recently came to New York I very gladly accompanied him, at his request, to the homes of pensioned widows, and I am very frank to confess at this time, as I was at that time, and in very strong terms indeed, that I was very much dissatisfied with the homes I saw. I do not believe that these homes were in any sense ideal homes; in fact, in my opinion, they were injurious to the children who lived in them. There is no doubt, in my mind, and I believe that all will agree in this, that the mother's home under normal conditions is the best possible home for a child. It is not a new theory, though it has been recently more strongly emphasized. But in New York the situation is peculiar. There exists a condition of congestion that is not duplicated in any of the other cities in this country. Further-

more, the income of the charities has always been very limited, with the result that we have been unable to give adequate allowances for the care of dependent children. The community there does not seem to have been educated to a realization of the fact that children should be as carefully nurtured in their mothers' homes as they are in the orphan asylums. In our report of 1908 we call the attention of the Jewish community to the advantages which institutional children had as against the children who were kept in their mothers' homes. Because of these conditions, I believe that a great many children would be better off in the orphan asylums than where they are at the present time. Recently an examination was made in Chicago, Boston and New York of the children of tuberculous parents—in Chicago by Dr. Sachs, in Boston by Drs. Floyd and Bowditch and in New York by Drs. Miller and Woodruff, and, as a result, the remarkable coincidence has shown that from 50 to 53 per cent. of the children of such parents were suffering from active tuberculosis. We have in the city of New York, conservatively speaking, about 5,000 Jewish consumptives. The records of the United Hebrew Charities show that there are on an average of 300 families treated month by month, in which one or both the parents are consumptive. It is only fair to assume that if an examination were made of the children in these families similar results would be shown. Of the 1,500 children admitted and discharged from the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society in the last five or six years only 5 children developed tuberculosis, in spite of the fact that over 30 per cent. of the parents of the children admitted to that institution had died or were suffering from the disease. In the face of such information, our theories on the question of child-caring must be qualified by the conditions we find in each different community.

CHAIRMAN WOLFENSTEIN: The paper is now open for discussion.

MR. CHESTER J. TELLER, New Orleans: The paper submitted this morning has, I believe, been among the most important papers contributed to this Conference, treating of the subject, as it does, in a scientific manner, based upon facts rather than upon guesses and opinions.

In judging the paper and its contents, two points ought to be especially stressed. Firstly, we must consider conditions as they exist in the various communities. The conditions of living, the problem of the dependent child, the financial resources of a community like New York are all one thing. In other communities we find very different conditions. Hence our conclusions would necessarily be quite different.

Secondly, we must remember that the homes used by the New York societies—I refer now to the boarding homes—are used for two special classes of dependent children, not for the ordinary dependent child, but for the exceptional dependent child. Under this head we refer to children under six years of age, because, unfortunately, the conditions of New York City today do not allow the admission of all such young children to institutions.

The second class of children that are cared for in the boarding homes of New York, under the supervision of the Hebrew Orphan Asylum and the Hebrew Guardian Society, are exceptional children. They are children who are abnormal or subnormal, either from the standpoint of their physical or their mental development.

Now I believe that this is the strongest argument that can be used in favor of this particular method, because it is a recognition for the first time—at least that has been expressed in this Conference—of the needs of the exceptional child.

Heretofore we have either refused admission to that child in institutions or else we have cared for the child in institutions without a special plan.

But this is a recognition that the children who are coming to the Jewish child-caring institutions of the community are in many cases exceptional children—subnormal, abnormal, defective—and that they have special needs and that they are being cared for in special ways, and I believe that a fair judgment of the advantages of the boarding-out system can only be had when we bear that fact in mind.

MR. SAUL DRUCKER, Chicago: A very peculiar city is New York. The problems there seem to be more difficult to solve than in a smaller community.

The idea of keeping children with their own mothers is that which would appeal mostly to a humanitarian. From the report here, it appears that they abstain as much as they can from placing children with their own mothers.

I heard a story once of a Jew in Russia, who had a boy about fourteen years of age. The boy's birth was never recorded in the city government, and the father being anxious to have a record made of it asked a friend's advice whether to record the age as sixteen or twelve. The friend said: "Why wouldn't it be more advisable to record fourteen years, the correct age?" The answer was: "This is something I never thought of."

This may serve as an illustration of the various child-caring agencies, which have devised every possible means for the proper care-taking of children, excepting the idea of keeping children with the mother, which, apparently, is something they never thought of.

The modern methods practiced in institutions may be compared to the work of the incubator, with the mother hen as a model. The incubator was invented after scientists observed the way the hen treated the eggs, while hatching the chicks. The correct temperature was taken, and having found out the work of the hen in every particular the incubator came about, following and imitating exactly the doings of the mother hen, with the result that it is now an improvement on the mother. The same thing is true with good institutions. We have certain institutions, so well and systematically arranged, and perfectly conducted, that they are an improvement on some private homes. In fact, the institution, when doing its proper work, not only cares for the child, but also is a guide to the mother—how to properly and scientifically train a child. For instance, the Marks Nathan Jewish Orphan Home of Chicago allows the mothers to make frequent visits to the children, permitting them to observe our training and management in every detail, so that when later the mother and children are reunited the former can follow out the principles instilled, without difficulty, and prevent friction. The little difficulties that may arise when a child is returned to the mother may be illustrated by the following: A mother came to me grievously

complaining that she could not get along with her boy; he absolutely refused to use the towel she gave him. Upon investigation, I found that the lad insisted upon having a towel for himself, and would not tolerate the one in common family use. Of course, this the mother couldn't understand.

Now, about the boarding-out system, or the hiring of professional stepmothers, New York seems to be lucky in the finding of proper Jewish homes for dependent children, but smaller communities are certainly not so fortunate. The Jewish Home Finding Society of Chicago was forced to give Jewish children into non-Jewish homes, because it could not find sufficient Jewish homes, where the love for strange children was so developed, that a child would be given other than stepmotherly care.

We cannot adopt the boarding-out plan till we succeed in educating the Jewish woman to develop a love for strange children and treat them as her own.

MRS. HENRY SOLOMON, Chicago: If the Chairman would call on some women. I want to call attention to the fact that the problem so far has been discussed by men that, some of them possibly, are unmarried. The subject has been discussed by the bachelors. I do think some women have some opinions on the subject and some have experience in work that ought to be told here. Personally, I don't believe in incubators as an improvement on the mother. If it had been I think the Lord Almighty would have invented incubators instead of mothers. The element of maternal love cannot be overlooked.

Every good theory ought to work out in fact, and there can be no question that the home is the proper place for a child.

It doesn't seem fair to me to compare the good institution with the bad home any more than the bad institution with the good home.

I have had experience in both directions. There are very great evils in institutions, evils that are not often touched upon before a general audience. I am perfectly willing to admit that we have some in which there are no evils and which are well conducted, and in which everything is good. But putting side by side the good home and the good institution there is no question but that the home is better, and putting side by side the bad institution



and the bad home there is no question but that the bad home is the better.

We have at home women who have had experience in home finding work, who are present, and can speak of facts. I believe it is difficult to find enough homes to go around, but they can be found.

A gentleman—I don't know whether he is a bachelor or not—said the question of sentiment didn't play any part. I think it plays a big part when it comes to children. I don't think you can educate without sentiment, because sentiment has so much to do with proper bringing up of children.

I call to mind a very young woman who refused to go to the hospital because she feared she couldn't get her children back. She was assured she would get them. She insisted upon bringing up her own children. I met her some weeks ago; I couldn't remember the incident, but she did, and told me that she and her children had never been separated, and now they were caring for her. That is not sentiment; that is a fact.

The separating of mother and children and putting the children in institutions in many instances is most cruel. I personally feel that there is no argument that can be brought in favor of institutions as against the good home.

It is very often a question of the support of the mother. This method is no experiment; the institution is an experiment, and very often it is not a successful experiment.

I hope the Conference will go on record as in favor of the more modern plan of boarding in the homes. Much might be said for and against these stepmothers, but I do hope the people in cities where it has been tried may say a word about it.

MISS MINNIE F. LOW, Chicago: A statement has been made this morning by our friend from Chicago, Mr. Drucker, so uncalled for and unwarranted, that we must, in justice to ourselves, refute it. I am a member of the Board of Directors of the Jewish Home Finding Society of Chicago. We have been accused of placing Jewish children in non-Jewish homes. The only occasions on which we do this is when we have young infants afflicted with



infectious diseases. Most of these infants are sick from the time of their birth, and are in need of such special care and nursing as the few non-Jewish women we have on our list can give them. Three of these women are practical nurses, qualified to care for delicate infants.

There is no phase of philanthropic endeavor fraught with greater responsibility than that of child-placing. To raise money from a charitably inclined public, and to spend it wisely, is indeed a great social trust. This trust, however, grows insignificant in the face of one directly responsible for the well-being of little children, and for their physical, moral, mental and spiritual development.

We have all heard of the unsatisfactory effects of insufficient relief-giving. We give our widows and deserted women a small pension, never enough; a little clothing now and then, never enough; we make of the 365 days of a year a continuous struggle for existence, and yet we expect these women to bring up their children properly, and we expect the children to grow up into the best type of citizenship.

I believe in the home for a child every time, but it must be the right sort of home, and in the right neighborhood. In Chicago we insist that the widows whom we compensate move into the better neighborhoods. We do not give them \$15.00 per month, as the relief agencies now give them, but we give them as much as \$50.00 per month, the amount depending upon the size of the family. In one case we are allowing a widow with four children \$50.00. We saw her last week, and she expressed herself as being "the happiest mother in Chicago." The principal of the school, which the children attend, wrote us a letter, unsolicited, speaking of the splendid condition in which the children are kept, and saying that the Home Finding Society was doing for this family what all the institutions in the world could not do—giving the mother the benefit of her children's love and society, and giving the children a mother's devotion and care.

We do not permit our compensated mothers to go out to work. They can supplement their incomes by doing some work in their homes, especially while the children are at school, but further than

this it is a condition imposed upon them that they do not leave the home nor the children to add to their incomes.

We find it is after all not the best plan to separate a mother from her children even temporarily. The mother, being relieved of the care of a home and children grows timid about reassuming the burden and responsibility. One woman, whose children had been in the institution for nearly two years, when told she must remove them and establish a home with compensation of \$35.00 per month, said: "I can't take care of my children; I am afraid to try it. If you had offered me this amount when my husband first died, when for days I walked about the building in which my children were put, just to see the place that held them, I would have been a very happy mother, but now my courage is gone." It took weeks of coaxing before this mother made up her mind to take her children.

In the matter of boarding homes, we also pay sufficient to get the right kind of homes, in the better quarters of the city. We pay on an average of \$15.00 per month for older children and \$12.00 per month for the younger children. Our homes are all neat, attractive and well kept. The women who have charge of our children are motherly, and are intensely interested in their little charges.

We have placed thirty-five children for adoption in splendid homes. Some of these are in homes of affluence, others in the more humble abodes. Dr. Wolfenstein, who visited us last week in Chicago, and saw some of our boarding and permanent homes, expressed himself as well satisfied with our selections.

We intend to go slow but sure in Chicago. There is a movement on foot to remove children from the Orphans' Home, and to permit their mothers to care for them. What can be done in the city of Chicago can doubtlessly be done in smaller communities. We cannot speak of the Chicago work and the New York work in the same breath. New York has problems so overwhelming that we are not justified in drawing comparisons.

MR. JACOB BASHEIN, New York: When I came to the National Conference it was with the intention of listening particularly to the discussion of the subject of "Boarding and Placing Out

Jewish Dependent Children With Private Families." My desire was to find out the best method of caring for children under the age of nine years. Considerable has already been said against the method of boarding children with private families, and so far I am not convinced that institutions on the congregate plan are the proper places for young children.

It strikes me as odd that the gentlemen who are so strongly in favor of the congregate plan admit that they have no personal knowledge of the boarding method, excepting what they have learned from an article by Dr. Wolfenstein. The arguments in this article have since been refuted by Dr. Bernstein, who, unfortunately, owing to illness, is unable to be with us today. Had the advocates of the congregate plan taken the trouble to investigate and study the problem of the boarding system for young children they would, I am sure, stand here today as advocates of the boarding-out plan, instead of opposing it.

Some people referred to the boarding method as an experiment, but you will permit me, ladies and gentlemen, to tell you that so far as the Hebrew Sheltering Guardian Society is concerned—who, by the way, conduct the largest Boarding Bureau for Jewish Dependent Children in this country—it has long passed the experimental stage. This will best be illustrated by the fact that during the Bureau's existence for the short period of five years nearly 1,100 children were taken care of to great advantage. Among these were a great number of children who were formerly in Jewish and non-Jewish institutions on the congregate plan, but who failed to thrive. Many of these children improved considerably after a brief stay in a private home.

I am sorry I have not with me some data of the weights and measurements taken by our physician, Dr. Gershel, pointing out the enormous gains that the children have made within brief periods in the private home.

I feel it would be underestimating the intelligence of the delegates were I to describe the advantages of the private home and the necessity of individual care for young children. Who will dispute the fact that the private home, which is the nearest to the parent's home, is not the proper place for a young child? The

affection and the tender care even in the poorest home gives the necessary sunshine for the growth of the child. No congregate institution—even Dr. Wolfenstein's—can give the individual attention to a child which the same child will receive in a private home. But the opponents of the boarding method say: How can you find desirable homes in fine localities, like cottages in the outlying districts, etc., for the insignificant sum of \$2.00 per week? My answer to this is that we really cannot find very wealthy families who will take children in board, nor can we find many families living in private cottages, but we do find many good Jewish homes located in light and sanitary quarters in the less congested sections in New York City. The following table will show the large number of applications which the society had to select from:

Applications received since July, 1905.....	1,572
Of this number received offering free homes there were....	192
Of this number received offering boarding homes there were..	1,380
Of this number for free homes, rejected.....	127
Of this number for boarding homes, rejected.....	1,100

The above applications are on file with this society.

The reason that this vast number of applications were rejected was not because of undesirability, but rather for the reason that the number of children that our society places in boarding homes is for the present time limited to 300, an arrangement which is entirely dependent on material circumstances.

The calibre of our mothers as was clearly pointed out to you by Messrs. Bressler and Waldman, who made a careful and exhaustive study of our homes, is equal to the best Jewish mother; every one of our homes is a better home than the one from which the child has come. Our homes are regularly supervised by agents and a trained nurse; the children are frequently examined by our physician; our homes are open at all times to the inspection of the city officials and to the public.

Our loss by death during the past five years was three children, and the illness in the homes is proportionately small.

The reason why most of our applicants apply for a child is a desire for the companionship of such child. Some have never had

any children of their own and others have lost their children. In these families instead of the child becoming a burden it brings sunshine and happiness to the home.

If you, ladies and gentlemen, will make an effort to learn more about the advantages and value of the boarding method you will, I am sure, establish similar agencies in your own cities and so avoid the necessity of transporting children hundreds of miles away to an orphan asylum in a distant city; this always entails the separation of the child from its relatives, with its subsequent hardships.

CHAIRMAN WOLFENSTEIN: Kindly excuse me for taking up about two minutes of your time in this discussion. I did not want to do it, but there has been a statement made by a lady from Chicago that most of the institutions are bad, and I deny that most emphatically. There is no Jewish orphan asylum in this country that is bad.

There was another statement made to the effect that the orphan asylum is an experiment, that to place the child in the home is the proper thing. I want to say that is wrong. The work of the orphan asylum is no experiment. The results of the orphan asylum are complete for the last fifty years; their work stands out prominently. In the paper read it has been acknowledged that there was no certainty about the outcome of the boarding-out plan of orphans. This is an admission that the same is considered an experiment. I say to you that there is no man in the world who has a right to experiment with a child.

MRS. SOLOMON: I did not mean to say that the orphan asylums were bad, but that the good home was better than the best orphan asylum.

DR. MAX LANDSBERG, Rochester: I say the same thing. I am in full sympathy with the ladies from Chicago.

Those who are managers of institutions are generally opposed to boarding out children. I was, therefore, particularly pleased to hear Dr. Bernstein take up the cause of placing children in homes. I am not influenced by either one or the other considera-



tion, but I have studied this question for years, year after year, not only theoretically, but practically. I have long been closely connected with orphan asylums, and I have always held, and always succeed in persuading my committee wherever it was possible to assist a widowed mother so lavishly that she could well take care of her own children.

Now there is only one thing I want to ask the gentleman from San Francisco: He says the women are not competent to bring up their children. Were they more competent when their husbands were alive?

Would you approve of sending into every household in the community an inspector to find out whether the father and mother are fit to take care of their children? It is certainly true that many well-to-do fathers and mothers are less competent to take care of their children than the poorest.

I want now to give an experience in placing children of widowed mothers in orphan asylums, which we have done in a number of instances.

These children were well cared for. They had much better places than they have in their mothers' homes. They had much better food. These children had been taken care of for six, seven or eight years, and when they came out of the institutions they refused to live with the mother because she could not give them the same beautiful accommodations they had enjoyed at the orphan asylum.

I claim the time will come, in less than twenty-five years, when orphan asylums will not cease to exist, but when orphan asylums will not be a boarding school, as considered by many people, but when they will be a temporary abode, and as soon as a good home is found the child will be taken out of the orphan asylum and put into the home. It is my experience that it is only a question of money. If you pay enough you can always find good homes.

CHAIRMAN WOLFENSTEIN: The Chair declares this discussion closed, and calls upon Mr. Teller to read his paper.



SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR JEWISH DEPENDENT CHILDREN WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO INDUSTRIAL AND TECHNICAL TRAINING.

By CHESTER JACOB TELLER,  
Superintendent Jewish Orphan Asylum,  
NEW ORLEANS, LA.

It is no vague thesis in general education that we are asked to unfold this morning. It is to the instruction, the special instruction, of the Jewish dependent child that this paper is addressed, more particularly to that phase of Jewish orphan education which is nowadays termed industrial training.

We venture at the very outset to raise the question: "Why should there be any special education of the Jewish orphan child?" Why is not general educational theory valid for all children alike? The answer to such questions is this: The problem of the education of the Jewish dependent child is a special problem, because, firstly, he is a Jewish child and Jewish education is always a matter of special study; secondly, the unnatural fact of his being orphaned or dependent early in life usually means, when analyzed, that he is the offspring of a weak or weakened physical stock, and, thirdly, the fact that he is dependent usually means, when analyzed, that he will not have the average opportunity of being gradually introduced to the realities of modern life, an opportunity which comes to most children of normal parentage; but that he will suddenly be placed upon his own resources, usually at about the age of 16 years, expected to meet the responsibilities which real life in a world of men imposes. For these three reasons, then, because he is a Jew, because he is usually physically weak or subnormal, because his preparation for independence must be crowded into a maximum of 10 years, we have in the education of the Jewish dependent child a special problem in education.

These are not theories, but facts, and facts which must be faced as they are. The fact that our children are in every case Jews and that we are of the same faith when translated into educational need means that we are dealing with the definite problem of Jewish

religious education. Understand me, I do not here make argument for those effete and unpedagogical methods in religious training, by which the Jewish orphan child is victimized with all the formal stuff that he can be made to swallow. The Jewish orphan is not to be made what someone has so aptly termed a "Versuchskaninchen." But I argue for the glow and warmth of Jewish life, for the genuine love of its history, its literature, its culture, its ideals, for the ceremonial life of the Jew, which nurtures self-respect and brings him to his past. Jewish history and literature, Jewish culture and Jewish life, are pregnant with educational possibilities which have never been fully developed, which have indeed been seldom even realized. Nor will they either until the fervent love of the task and the pedagogical insight are combined with the opportunity to execute and apply them. Unfortunately, the opportunity for the special education of its wards has come to but a few of our Jewish orphanages, and it is noteworthy that in those which conduct or control their own schools the splendid possibilities for the development of Jewish subject matter and its correlation with the general secular subject matter have never once been realized or understood. All of which proves that it is not enough that we educate our orphans under our own auspices and control. We need far more effective methods of bringing home to them the beauty, the truth and the power of our faith.

The second elemental fact with which we must reckon is the stock from which our Jewish dependent children are recruited. Now it is far from my intention to underrate the vigor and the sturdiness of the Jewish lineage, but anyone who has studied even superficially the causes of dependency among Jewish children knows that tuberculosis and nervous degeneracy in one form or another are together responsible for the major portion of the orphans and half-orphans among us. While it has been definitely established that none of these diseases is hereditary, we know full well that they result in a general weakness in the offspring, often, indeed, amounting to a predisposition toward the parent's ailment. It is not to be gainsaid that the majority of the applicants to our orphanages, when examined, are found to be either physically subnormal or at least suffering from general weakness or special defect.

Under such circumstances, it is not enough that we clothe them decently and provide three good meals a day and a comfortable bed. This is not an ordinary problem in physical care, but a special problem in physical education. It calls for a constructive health program. It means that we measure our results not by the amount of illness we can cure or even prevent, but by the amount of positive health vigor and physical efficiency we can create. It means that we are first to ascertain by special test and examination the following information:

1. What number of children have defective teeth?
2. What number have defective eyes?
3. What number show diseases of the skin or scalp?
4. What number show weakness or defect of a vital or reproductive organ?
5. What percentage of children have adenoids, poor hearing, swollen tonsils, chronic conditions of ear, nose or throat?
6. What percentage of the children indicate orthopædic defects, such as flat foot, hip deformities or spinal curvature.
7. How many of the children show traces of tuberculosis, impurities or casts in the urine, impurities of blood, anæmia, intestinal parasites, such as tapeworm, pinworm, hookworm and the like.
8. What number of the children are mentally defective or atypical?

These eight tests call for the services of specialists. They involve a carefully arranged system of physical charts and health records. They make necessary the presence of a resident physician or a resident trained nurse in every institution for the care of dependent children, and they presuppose, when undertaken with any degree of sincerity, the following educational features:

1. A carefully prepared dietary, based upon common sense, the ages of the children, changes in season, climate, etc. The use of coffee as food for young children is questionable common sense.
2. A special dietary for undeveloped and anæmic children.
3. A program of play under the care of a director, whose business it is to initiate new games and encourage the play spirit, rather than to organize and engineer every play effort.

4. A separate clinic for the daily treatment of chronic ailments and minor troubles.

5. A dental clinic for the regular and systematic attention of the teeth.

6. An outdoor playground and an indoor gymnasium for constructive and correctional development.

7. A rigid inspection and care of hair and scalps.

8. An ungraded class under the supervision of a teacher specially trained in the latest methods of the psychological clinic, with respect to arrested and retarded development in children.

The third and last cardinal point in Jewish orphan education is the fact that the orphan, not the exceptional, but the average orphan, needs a training which will equip him as well as it possibly can for an independent career at the age of 16 or 17 years. This does not imply any disapproval of the higher education of the orphan. On the contrary, we believe that this tendency should be encouraged wherever warranted by individual capacities. Such a policy, however, applies only to the exceptional case and does not in the least vitiate the rule. Stated in other terms, then, our problem is as follows: How can we best develop in the dependent child the character, maturity, and responsibility, the general intelligence and the specific ability successfully to meet the demands of a modern industrial era? Our common educational formulas may be all well and good with respect to the ordinary child of the normal home, whose burdens are often placed upon him only as fast as he is ready to carry them, but the orphan child, as a rule, has no alternative. He must be prepared. The fact that he has a mother or father living sometimes makes his task a little lighter, but just as often has the very opposite effect. With very few exceptions, the child must be equipped with the intelligence necessary for an economically independent life in the great industrial world. He must have, in fine, industrial training. Now, defining industrial training, therefore, as industrial intelligence, as preparation for industrial efficiency, then manifestly anything that ministers to the child's industrial needs is comprised in the term industrial education.

Let us ascertain, if we can, the chief elements in industrial intelligence.

Industrial life is, in the first place, communal or co-operative life, social life, if you will. It gives rise to certain social or community relations, relations of the individual to the group, relations between individuals and relations between smaller groups of individuals. Industrial life is, in short, a life of obligations and interrelations; it is, in the highest sense of the word, a moral or an ethical life. Industrial intelligence should include a knowledge, then, of the ethical aspect of the industrial world.

But industrial training involves more than ethical training. The trained or skilled industrial worker must possess a general intelligence as a basis for the special knowledge of his trade or vocation. He needs such capacities, for example, as initiative, painstakingness, judgment, foresight, co-operation. He needs, too, a general knowledge of wealth and its meaning, of its production, its distribution and consumption, he must know something of tools and tool processes. But industrial intelligence is more than this. It is ethical and general intelligence plus. And by that plus quantity we understand technical and vocational intelligence, that phase of education, be it mechanical, commercial or professional, which is directly employed in the making of one's livelihood. When closely scrutinized, therefore, it will be seen that our need of industrial training is not one, but three, a carefully thought-out system of moral discipline (what the Germans call "Zucht"), a specially prepared curriculum and method for the general branches and a definite program of vocational training adapted in each case to individual tastes and inclinations.

An analysis of these three needs brings us to the end of our study.

Returning then to what we have called the need of a moral discipline, let us develop that thought. I contend that the discipline in vogue in the generality of our asylums today, and usually known as the monitorial system, is a non-moral system; non-moral because it is non-social, non-industrial; non-moral because it is unrelated to the discipline which latter life exacts. I know it may be argued that children need some tangible evidence of authority, that they cannot grasp the conception of self-imposed restraint, and



this argument deserves our respect whenever made on behalf of the average child of average parents. However, so long as we deal not with such children, but with orphans, and so long as we send our orphans into the great modern industrial life, at the average age of 16 years, it behooves us to find fitter preparation for them along the lines of ethical or social training. Fortunately, we find in the very condition which the institution imposes great possibilities for the creation of a completely moral or social atmosphere. The vast numbers with which we deal (in some of our institutions exceeding 1,000 children), heretofore presenting the greatest difficulty from the standpoint of character building now provide our finest conditions, our best material for an effective scheme of social education. The very condition which creates the need also furnishes the solution. As a result, we have recently seen developed in child-caring work, and, especially in Jewish child-caring work, a movement away from the autocratic monitorial system in favor of a more democratic self-governing plan. This latter plan is far more difficult to work with, requires far more time and patience on the part of administrators, but has proved to be, in the hands of wise and tactful directors, a vast improvement over any other plan. The duties and obligations of our democratic society can be learned only by participating in it. Under the plan of modified self-government as now conducted in some Jewish child-caring institutions, a miniature community is established, a community in which each individual member is gradually introduced to the most important concepts of industrial life, self-imposed restraint, civic or community pride, subordination of the individual interests to group interests, co-operative effort or team work and responsibility to authority vested in duly elected officers. After five or ten years spent in such an environment the dependent child is practically prepared for the duties of communal life. There is no danger that he be dazzled and bewildered by the sudden freedom from restraint, coupled with new and difficult burdens. Both the freedom and the burdens are well known to him. He has lived a communal life, in which he has learned responsibility and self-restraint, both of them invaluable elements in the preparation for industrial life.

The second aspect of industrial education is the general intelligence, which all special intelligence presupposes. Too much stress cannot be laid upon this side of our problem, for there can be no such thing as an industrially efficient man or woman who has not first been equipped with a substratum of general knowledge. That plan so much in vogue in the orphan education of the day, by which a child is taken out of his grade at the age of 12 or 13 and put into the laundry school, or the machine-operating class, or the millinery class, or the printing class, is not industrial education, but industrial stupidity. The boy who leaves his sixth-grade studies each afternoon to assume the duties of janitor, or the girl who neglects her studies to take up vocational training in the sewing-room, will make neither good janitors nor good seamstresses. All industrial training in this narrow sense presupposes the general intelligence gained in the elementary grades.

The consensus of opinion among students is that this general education should continue at least up to the fourteenth birthday. Among Jewish children, a large number have completed the entire eight grades of the elementary school by that time. However that may be, the graded curriculum should be arranged with a view to industrial values always. In geography, emphasis should be laid on the commercial and economic sides, history should be industrial largely, arithmetic should be taught in closer relation to modern business practice. As the child grows older he should become more and more acquainted with the methods and processes of modern industry, his entire school course must be based on real conditions of life, his own life, if you will, and, most important of all, the manual and domestic arts must receive attention from the very first year. Moreover, for Jewish children, especially of those of Yiddish-speaking communities, education in German in the elementary school is valuable. Industrial efficiency is often as much a matter of linguistic as of manual skill, unless we view it in that narrow way, which confines it to carpentering, plumbing, millinery, sewing and the like.

All this entails an entire renovation of the average curriculum. It means a complete overhauling of methods and matter now in use. Too long have we been dressing the orphan with the cast-off

clothes of others. Similarly we have reached the time when the Jewish orphan is to have an education to fit him, not the educational misfit with which he has been trained these many years.

After six to eight years (varying according to the child) of such general training, during which a broad general intelligence has been imparted, he is ready for the third element in his industrial training, the technical element. Nor do I use this word "technical" in the narrow sense, as it is used in our so-called technical schools, but rather as a synonym for vocational, and, I compromise under it therefore, any special or vocational training which can be imparted in two or three years, such as bookkeeping, stenography and typewriting, manicuring and hair-dressing, agriculture, millinery, machine-operating, designing, cutting, printing and the like. To state the relative values of these different vocations would be to engage in a purely academic study. From a large number of reports collected from various institutions, I have concluded that any such classification would be futile. I approach the question, therefore, from an entirely different angle.

As a guiding principle in vocational education we must understand that it cannot be attempted for children under 14 years of age. This is a matter upon which all educators are practically agreed. With this point established then, we have a period of two or three years remaining for the technical instruction. Manifestly the motive here is an entirely new one, and with the new motive comes a new principle. From now on our problem is simply one of preparation for a livelihood. From now on, therefore, the necessity for special education under the auspices of the orphanage is removed. In fact, unless the institution is located in the country, or away from great centers, better facilities might be offered by other educational institutions. It would be folly to advocate special equipment for all the vocations that boys and girls fall heir to; it would result merely in inefficiency and duplication. Rather let use be made of the existing institutions, the commercial and business schools, the commercial high schools, the art, the technical and the trade schools.

The choice of the vocation is another question, not to be settled academically. There has been a tendency of late to send our boys

to the technical schools. Pattern making, wood turning, machine shop practice, agriculture have been tried in the hope of preparing the Jewish orphan for independent industrial life. In the same way the girls have learned machine-operating and millinery. But these practices have not always been satisfactory. Too often they are justified neither by the trade nor the child. In several instances the children have been prepared to undertake the purely mechanical work only. In other cases no employment could be found for boys who had spent two years in preparation for a special trade. Moreover, the Jewish psyche is not one to be contented with any vocation that leads to a maximum wage of \$15.00 per week, or even \$20.00. The Jewish boy recognizes no upper wage limit. Put him in a shop where, at the age of 25, he has reached his limit of \$20.00 per week and he will desert his profession for commerce or become a manager in another line. Only the lower types of Jewish intelligence can be kept in the machine shop or on the farm. The rest are impelled by the force of their Jewish natures to break bounds and try again. It is therefore an injustice in many cases to attempt to fit Jewish children for the ranks of so-called skilled laborers. We may satisfy an educational hobby of ours; it may tickle us to learn that Jews are raising wheat and potatoes, or building machines, but the fact is that neither in the factory nor in the field have we found a correct solution to our vocational problem.

What then shall our orphans learn? That depends, firstly, on the individual, and, secondly, on the industrial conditions and educational opportunities of each locality. One community reports plumbing as a very fertile field for young men, another gives manicuring as a profession of dignity and practicability for the girls. Most of us, I daresay, have found that the commercial studies, such as business methods and stenography, have proven to be the best investments. Two important principles must ever be kept in mind: First, in fitting our children for vocations we cannot know too much about the children nor can we know too much about the vocation. Secondly, should unforeseen results make necessary a desertion from the field for which a given child has been trained, after all, the loss is not very great, so long as the

character has been moulded, in conformity with social and industrial ideals, and the fundamental lessons of real life imparted through a carefully prepared curriculum in the elementary grades.

CHAIRMAN WOLFENSTEIN: The meeting will stand adjourned until two o'clock.

---

Thursday, May 19, 1910.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

SECRETARY WALDMAN (presiding): Professor Sabsovich will discuss Mr. Teller's paper.

#### DISCUSSION.

By H. L. SABSOVICH,  
Director Baron de Hirsch Fund,  
NEW YORK, N. Y.

I am requested to discuss the excellent paper of Mr. Teller, but I would rather say something about what is to be done with boys and girls between the ages of 14 and 16, not only those dependent upon charity, but those who are taken care of by their parents as well.

The children of these ages are too young to enter the skilled professions. The boys usually take unskilled positions in offices, stores, factories and shops, and when they reach the earning age of 16 to 18 they have small chance of advancing themselves, and having no trade they drift from one employment to another. If they fail to improve, during this time, the knowledge they acquired in the public schools, they often forget the little they learned in the schools. This question of what to do with boys and girls of 14 to 16 years of age became in New York, as elsewhere, of vast importance. The city and the State of New York are therefore taking steps toward solving the problem by introducing vocational schools. Such a school for boys was opened last September for those who have gone to the sixth grade or its equivalent, and they receive not only academic training, but professional training as



well. A considerable part of their time is spent in the shops where printing, carpentry, plumbing, electric wiring and blacksmithing are taught. Even if this and similar schools should only develop some mechanical aptitude in the pupils and reduce the number of drifters, who are sooner or later bound to become a menace to society, their existence would be justified.

The length of the course is from one to three years. The Hebrew Technical School for Boys and the Baron de Hirsch Trade School fill partly the demand for trade and technical education for Jewish boys and young men. The Clara de Hirsch Home for Working Girls and the Hebrew Technical School for Girls give industrial training to girls. The Manhattan Trade School for Girls was taken over by the Board of Education of the City of New York.

By introducing industrial training as an educational feature in the orphan asylums it would help the movement toward trade education, and send out boys and girls with distinctly developed mechanical inclinations and prepared to take up trade as a life vocation.

As concerns farming, the general impression is that there is no use in training our children to take up farming, as farming is not a Jewish occupation and that attempts to make farmers out of Jews have universally proven failures. We have heard a young minister speak on the great possibilities of farming in general in this country, and he proposes, by establishing test farms, to make American farmers out of Jewish immigrants. At the same time he condemned all the previous efforts at colonizing, particularly in the South and in the West. A gentleman from Memphis, also a minister, I believe, tells us of the failure of colonization in Texas. He did not tell us, however, that immigrants were sent to a fever-stricken district.

The fact is, however, that throughout the United States there are thousands of prosperous Jewish farmers. Within twelve miles of Hartford, Conn., for instance, there is a settlement of from 25 to 30 prosperous Jewish farmers, who are not only Jews, but Americans as well. Their houses are equipped with telephone service; some have modern heating appliances, sewerage and, above

all, they use modern methods of farming. They are among the best tobacco raisers in the country.

There are several colonies in the Southern part of New Jersey. It is true that the experiences of these pioneers have been of the hardest kind, but they have succeeded in overcoming their difficulties and are now not only very prosperous, but are known as the finest sweet potato raisers in the country. They raise the famous "Vineland Sweets."

Although I have had many bitter disappointments in my life's work, I am nevertheless more optimistic than ever as to the future of Jewish farming. With the encouragement that the Jews now have to own and work their own land, farming is steadily getting a permanent foothold among Jews. In fact it has long passed the experimental stage, and I hope to see it steadily grow broader and vaster in numbers, and the orphan asylums would do well to introduce horticulture and agriculture into their educational program, as there is no doubt that many of the wards would develop an inclination to take farming up as a vocation, and thus afford many a healthy opportunity to grow outside of the congested and overcrowded city employments.

#### DISCUSSION—(*Continued*).

By HENRY WOOLF,

Superintendent of Leopold Morse Home,

MATTAPAN, MASS.

This month appears, from report, to be the season of our fiscal Rosh Hashona in many Jewish institutions. Unfortunately, I received Mr. Teller's interesting paper just the day before our fiscal gathering here, our annual meeting day, which took place yesterday, Sunday, the 15th inst. I have read his argument through, though it would have given me more pleasure to discuss it after a more careful study of his opinions.

I agree with Mr. Teller in those general theories which he has expounded, which are fundamental in the principles of child training. I will also agree with Mr. Teller in his exposition of our modern social life, which, for this season of our civilization,

is clothed in an industrial garb. However, I did expect to find his argument concern itself more definitely with the latter part of the thesis concerning the special education for Jewish dependent children, namely, "with particular reference to technical and industrial training." I may be mistaken in the intention of those who selected this subject, but it seems to me that it calls for more definite argument on the subject of industrial and technical training in the "narrow sense," as Mr. Teller designates it, than along the lines of the general education of Jewish children in large congregate institutions.

It appears that the writer disparages and frowns upon the past results in Jewish institutions in both the religious and in the secular training. In the early part of his paper he makes the statement, "we need far more effective methods of bringing home to them the beauty, the truth and the power of our faith." No one will argue the fact that we owe to the child special religious training which will bring him into possession of his Jewish inheritance, but it seems to me, and I may be mistaken again, that in the past generation—I was a very young child then and may not have understood—but it seems to me that in those days, whatever the methods, we were trained to be thoroughly Jewish, or "God-fearing." Toward the end of his paper he makes this statement: "It means a complete overhauling of methods and matter now in use. Too long have we been dressing the orphan with the castoff clothes of others. Similarly we have reached the time when the Jewish orphan is to have an education to fit him, not the educational misfit with which he has been trained these many years."

I admire the writer's push and desire to be progressive, but personally I would not be so revolutionary in the plans I advocate. If we are to judge by the results of the lives of those who have come out of institutions in the past, we generally find them to reflect credit rather than discredit upon the methods in vogue, which therefore, must have fit and not "misfit" the conditions of those years.

I have no doubt that if Pestalozzi's methods of child training of his orphan children were analyzed in the searchlight of modern

criticism, notwithstanding the excellent results of his strenuous work, that great leader would only class as a mediocre pedagogue today.

In his treatment of the industrial and technical training of the dependent child, I do not see wherein the writer proves that the orphan requires any different training from that of the normal child, even the non-Jewish child, as far as his preparation for participation in the great world of industry is concerned.

I am an ardent believer in technical and industrial training for the Jewish dependent child, whether he be sub-normal or normal, although that phase of education it has been found, does offer an excellent outlet for certain energies of even defective children. Personal experience along industrial lines in which I have engaged for many years leads me to advocate the training in question. To my mind, a greater cause for devoting attention to this phase of education exists in the fact that among the large numbers in homes of all kinds opportunities should be given, just as they ought to be given to normal and sub-normal children in less unfortunate families, to develop along such lines and to follow such pursuits for which they may show greater talent than for other callings, and for which they may have a predisposition on account of possessing a talent, mechanical, scientific, artistic, commercial or otherwise.

The large majority of children in homes and out of homes are usually sent into the great industrial world, using that term again in its broader meaning, to specialize only in the commercial phase of it. Intelligent business men are witnesses that the large majority of those overcrowding the commercial branches are, for the most part, of a low standard of mediocrity, and even among those who are so-called graduates of business schools an amazing proportion does not reach higher than the \$15.00 and \$20.00 a week class.

I, therefore, repeat that it will be gainful for our youthful dependents, where the home or institution has the means, to introduce those forms of industrial training whereby the child may be able to discover himself, or through the medium of which the instructor may be able to discover a superior talent along mechanical lines, or scientific, or artistic, so that the foster-parent or superintendent

shall be enabled to intelligently direct him in such pursuit where he will be most likely to excell. If the child also possess the commercial and executive talent, he will surely rise above the \$20.00 limit in his own calling. It widens the possibility of following out the great principle so beautifully expressed by the poet, Longfellow, "study yourselves well and learn wherein kind Nature meant you to excel."

I would advocate that we keep in mind in our institution and home training, the future of the child, not only while he is a child in the home, but also while he is a child after he has left the home. The present is great, but the future is greater.

In his entire discussion about preparing the child for the industrial world, in the broad application of that term, Mr. Teller neglects altogether the direction, advice, and encouragement of the child when he has actually begun to really participate in the world's industries. If he places so much emphasis on the care of the teeth, the scalp, the skin, while the child is in the home, how much greater need is there to keep in touch with him and to direct him when he is just starting out for himself in the industrial world, of which we speak. I claim that we are placing him in an abnormal condition when we put him into the world "independent" unless we make him feel that he is not deserted at this critical period, by his foster-parent. That is the time when the boy needs most of our encouragement and when the girl requires our solicitous care and guidance. If we are going to abandon them at this point of their development we are not justified in casting stones at the deserting parents of neglected children.

In the training of children we must be definite and practical. not too theoretical, and when we have before us the miracle of the Lord in the form of the adolescent child commencing his career, we must take our shoes from off our feet so as to be nearer the earth in our treatment of this problem.

MISS CECIL B. WIENER, Buffalo (presiding): The first paper of this session is entitled "The Relation Between the Social Worker and His Organization," by Dr. Boris D. Bogen, of Cincinnati.



## THE RELATION OF A SOCIAL WORKER TO HIS ORGANIZATION.

By BORIS D. BOGEN,  
Superintendent United Hebrew Charities,  
CINCINNATI, OHIO.

Wise physicians prohibit their patients from constantly speaking of their ailments. The social worker should realize his weaknesses and try to overcome the unfortunate habit of grumbling and complaining of the unsatisfactory and often unjust treatment he thinks he is receiving from those "higher up."

As a public servant, the social worker must have respect for his own community, must be loyal to it, must make himself a part of it and take upon himself the representation of the communal interests in all possible directions. The grumbling, dissatisfied social worker, constantly complaining of the community that employs him, is a poor excuse of a leader, and deserves pity rather than encouragement. Still there may be some satisfaction in opening one's heart and stating his grievances to the public, analyzing his true position, expressing a protest and demanding sympathy and just consideration. These probably are the reasons that prompted the committee on program to include the subject of the relationship of the social worker to his organization in the discussions of this Conference. The speaker, however, wishes to emphasize that it was not his choice to present the topic, and that, in fact, he requested to be released from the unpleasant duty of tackling such a delicate proposition. Through moral suasion, however, he was induced to accept the task, for he realized that if the subject is to be presented he probably would be the person who could afford to do it without serious consequences. His position in respect to his community is fortunately such as to make it impossible to regard his remarks personal, and whatever he has to say is more a matter of observation than a result of his own experiences. He need not fear that his appearance may be taken as an expression of his own grievances toward his organization, for he has none, nor must he be careful that his statements may reflect upon the community which he represents. The office of a paid social worker is rather of a recent origin. At the beginning

the employment of a social worker is a matter of compromise, it is only through necessity that an organization becomes willing to spend money for management, and even then there are always some persons who consider the expenses for management not a legitimate item in connection with philanthropic activity. In many instances the introduction of a paid worker is gradual; often a person, after giving his services for a considerable time gratis, is given a small compensation, seldom sufficient to justify the employment of his entire time. Again in other communities the new field opens an opportunity to help a poor and unfortunate man or woman, who is thereby placed in a position where he can presumably earn a livelihood. To engage a social worker in this case means a double charity. While this is true historically, it is also applicable to the present conditions, and almost every community, if not as a whole, yet in part, retains the old views and considers a social worker as a charitable adjunct rather than a real necessity. Anyone who has had the experience of advertising for a social worker knows from the character of the persons aspiring to fill the vacancy how little uniformity there is in the supposed qualifications. Men of high social standing in the community will recommend their friends, sometimes even their relatives, whose only qualifications are the close relationship with the sponsor. Again there is usually pressure brought to get in some deserving member of the community, who cannot do anything else, and probably for this very reason will be able to do social work. You get applications from people without any experience, bold enough to say that they believe they can learn the tricks of the profession very rapidly; again from others without any education, claiming that they think that education, after all, is not altogether necessary. Again you may get candidates somewhat qualified, but all of them take it for granted that if they do not get the appointment it is not because they come short of the requirements, but because they did not carry sufficient pull or were prevented from getting the position by somebody in the field interested in behalf of some third person.

The development of social activities and the specialization according to the character of the work makes the term "social worker" too general. The qualifications of a superintendent of an institution, those of a relief agent or head worker of a settlement are and should be of a different character. Still there is one underlying

principle, and this is the general adaptation for social service. The management of our institutions, especially the orphan asylums and hospitals, has been considerably improved lately. The responsibilities connected with these offices became apparent, and the necessity of qualified persons in charge became imperative. Our homes for the aged are still following the old régime. The conditions of our relief agencies are especially instructive. In the olden times the distribution of charity was considered in itself an act of benevolence. Even children were given an opportunity to give alms to the poor directly. Conditions have changed, the scope of philanthropy has been greatly extended and has become more complicated. The problem of helping the poor is at present a sociological question. We are beginning to look for results, we are beginning to realize the necessity of a system, we are endeavoring to introduce economy and to avoid unnecessary waste.

Individual charity has been transferred into a co-operative enterprise, and it is only a question of time when it will become a municipal function entirely. The management and the distribution of charity funds has become a serious matter. It is not always pleasant; it calls forth stringent measures with a number of undeserving applicants; it requires close attention; it involves considerable work preparatory to the distribution; it implies investigation, organization and careful handling of each and every case. Naturally a work of this character cannot be left entirely in the hands of volunteers. Hence the necessity of a paid worker, the superintendent. The office of the superintendent, however, carries a different meaning in different communities. In some places the superintendent is nothing but a clerk, again, in others, he is the executive officer, with little power and no authority, and only in a few instances is the superintendent considered a leader of the community, directing the work and supplying plans and policies as to the different philanthropic activities. On the other hand, unfortunately, professional efficiency is not a general rule among the superintendents of relief agencies. The requirements for the office are still indefinite, and, while communities are beginning to recognize the importance of a qualified superintendent, they are, as a matter of fact, compelled to make their selections from among people without any special training. Under these circumstances, the superintendent enters the community not as a leader, but, at

least at the start, as an agent, ready to execute orders and follow directions. Who can blame a community that is unwilling to thrust in the hands of an inexperienced and untrained worker the care of dependents?

On the other hand, in the selection of a superintendent, the different communities are guided by different standards. Lately, the requirements became more positive. The appearance, the general bearing, the moral tone and disposition, eloquence and refinement are taken into consideration. It is only in exceptional cases where professional efficiency is sought for. How many communities care whether their superintendent possesses the knowledge of modern sociology, political economy, psychology, etc.? How many of the Jewish communities dealing with immigrants mostly demand that their superintendent know the language of the immigrants, their past, their peculiarities, their tendencies, their merits and their shortcomings? And these theoretical preparations are only a part of the qualifications of a superintendent, who is destined to become a leader in modern philanthropy.

In our settlement work the conditions are still less satisfactory. The requirements of a settlement worker are unreasonable, the work in its character is indefinite, the accomplishments of an efficient settlement worker are too manifold to be found in one person. Besides, the bulk of the work is done by volunteers, whose selection is a difficult matter, and, as a rule, the head worker has little choice in the matter. As a result of all this, the qualifications of a settlement worker are measured in a degree by the demands of the volunteers. The charming personality, the smooth talker, has better chances than an efficient communal worker, a man or woman of ideas, sincere and well meaning.

A social worker assuming a new position finds that one of his first, if not the most difficult, tasks is to get the confidence of the board of managers and to gain a hold upon the community that will establish proper relationship between him and his organization. If the record of his previous achievements is of some value, it will help him to start with a made reputation. He will be accordingly introduced, and will have to live up to the expectations. But even then his manners, voice, conversation, tendencies, views that he confesses, sociability, etc., will be critically scrutinized, and will mean a great deal in securing him a strong foothold in his new

position. Should he, however, be a person who has already been known to the community, and has been chosen for some other reason, than his experience as a social worker, his road toward success, is still more difficult, and the entire attitude will depend upon how successful he may be at the very beginning. In this case he meets a critical attitude, a lack of confidence.

As a rule, however, a social worker, when engaged for a new position, finds that he is met with open arms, and is shown a great deal of consideration in the beginning. But often his first experiences are not lasting. The trouble begins frequently from an insignificant episode. A mistake, an unnecessary friction that could be easily avoided and overlooked, causes anxiety, and is sufficient to overthrow the entire equilibrium, producing a storm in what promised to be an ideal atmosphere of relations. Under these circumstances it is quite natural that a social worker has to be careful from the very start, and this leads us to the consideration of a peculiar psychological feature, namely, the social worker's fear of his organization. Notwithstanding the growing demand for social workers, each and every one of them is in constant fear of losing his position, for he knows, and his friends do not fail to tell him, that to lose a position is, after all, a great deal easier than to get another one. This fear on the part of the social worker makes him very sensitive to the opinions of his superiors—he cannot stand any criticism coming from them, exaggerating its importance, taking too seriously every word uttered by any of his directors, a condition which is responsible for a peculiar ambition, characteristic of almost of everyone connected with social service. Realizing this ambition, the organizations are very generous in giving praise to their paid workers, making public acknowledgments of the wonderful achievements, though a little careful in advancing their salaries.

In preparing this paper it seemed advisable to interview a few leading professional workers and inquire confidentially what are the relations existing between the given individuals and their respective organization. We shall quote the answers promiscuously:

“My organization does not understand the problem. I cannot explain to them my attitude. They do not appreciate the difficulties and hardships and think that this is a store. It is impossible to please them.”



"My board are just darlings, there is nothing they would not do for me; honest, their relations are just ideal."

"My board think they know all. They are not open to conviction and are not accustomed to have a paid worker differ from their views. The only thing to do is to humor them."

"They certainly treat me right and think highly of me. One must know how to show up; they are taken by the few things that I do."

"Why I have given my life to please them, have become a nervous wreck. I suppose they would be only too glad if I resigned."

"My board is certainly fine to me, I appreciate their kindness. I cannot expect them to treat me as their equal after all. I hope they are satisfied with me."

"The trouble is in Mr. or Miss So and So, they have full confidence in her or him, and whatever he or she says is law. It is no use to fight the impossible."

"I am getting tired of the explicit confidence the board shows to me. I begin to feel that they ought to share the responsibility and not leave everything to me."

"The organization, as a whole, needs an education as regard recognition of the standing of a social worker. I do not want to become too familiar with my board. Careful, tactful and conservative action keeps my board in satisfactory condition."

"Mr. So and So is afraid that somebody else will get the credit. He takes it upon himself to deprive a fellow of a chance."

"My board realized the changes I have introduced; they see the difference between my predecessor and me; they certainly have respect for my education. They like to see me putting a scientific coloring to our work."

"Since I am working for them, they never greeted me with a handshake."

"My board loves to hear others praise me."

"They certainly make me work like a slave, and it is impossible to please them."

"My board is satisfied with me. Our relations are fine, I am entirely independent."

We could continue quoting different opinions, but all of them would represent a slight variation of the same theme. Evidently

not in all cases do the opinions expressed represent the true situation. They show, however, how sensitive the social worker is and how much he takes to heart the attitude of the board toward him and the work he does.

The most frequent cause of friction between the social worker and his organization is the difference of opinions as to the method and tendency of the work itself.

In the relief agency the worker may be accused of being too lenient or too severe, as the case may be; in the institution the question of discipline may cause considerable trouble; in settlement work the lack of restraint and the character of activities may not meet with the approval of the board. This is a legitimate and natural controversy, and it is the duty of the worker, if he is given a chance, to bring about a uniformity of ideas. Unfortunately, often the worker sacrifices his own personality in attempting to compromise difficulties, he becomes a champion of a cause in which he himself does not believe. He changes methods not because he is convinced of the wrong of it, but because the board will be better pleased with it, and by doing so does not emphasize the fact that he is not responsible for the new way; just on the contrary, he praises the things that he hates and downs those that he internally believes to be good.

The tendency on the part of the members of the board to apply a business criterion to philanthropic activities is often the cause of considerable friction between the organization and the social worker. The social worker is often kept responsible for raising of funds, and is kept busy inventing schemes or executing the schemes of his board for the purpose of obtaining money for the different activities. In some organizations an unreasonable economy is enforced, and the recent fad to get returns from the constituency itself leads to a most unsatisfactory role that the social worker is made to assume. Relief societies are attempting to base their adequacy upon the amount of money repaid by the applicants, an arrangement that defeats the very purpose of a relief agency. The work of the latter should not be confused with that of a free loan society. A free loan society advances money under a certain guaranty, either in the form of a pledge or the assurance

of a third person, who is in position to assume the responsibility in case the payment is not forthcoming. A failure to repay a loan in a free loan society would bar a person from further transactions. The relief agency cannot afford to put this ultimatum. The truth is, that if a person is not in position to pay his debt he would probably need more assistance, and if his need is substantiated by investigation he ought to get it. The return of a loan to a charity agency should not entitle the person to continue to remain on the charity list for a longer time than is absolutely necessary.

In institutions, hospitals, asylums, schools, etc., the importance attached to the sometimes very insignificant income is usually exaggerated. Meanwhile the social worker is compelled to show results in dollars and cents, and if he fails in this particular respect he loses his standing. He appreciates the falsity of his position, and naturally protests against this unfair measure of his achievement, causing a feeling of discontent on the part of the organization.

In settlement work the lack of appreciation of special paid assistants, and the idea of getting along with volunteer service exclusively, is responsible for the physical breakdown of a social worker, and for the unavoidable failure producing friction and unpleasantness in the relations of the social worker and his board. The social worker who fails to recognize, however, the rights of the members of the board, who fails to appreciate the importance of the views of the large number of contributors to his cause and who ignores public opinion, is partly responsible himself if he does not find satisfactory relations between himself and his organization.

A social worker must never forget that the board of managers are the choice of the public; they are the trustees of public funds; they are instrumental in making ample provisions for the material support of the different activities, and are responsible for the entire workings of the organization; they are the controlling medium, and it is their duty and privilege to examine, approve or disapprove his actions; they are entitled to know all the details of the different transactions, and must be put in position to watch results. The social worker who succeeds in being left alone, be it because the

members of the board are indifferent to their duties and are too busy with their own affairs, or because they have full confidence in him and do not want to interfere with his prerogative, may find himself in a predicament when he awakens to the fact that his board did not keep pace with the progress made and is unable to give him the co-operation which he may want. The same is true of the worker who is attempting to keep his board in ignorance of the true status of the situation, who misrepresents reality and substitutes for it results pleasing to the board. While the different boards are partly responsible for this situation by encouraging the social workers to report nothing but what they want reported, still the social workers are to blame considerably for this deceitful tendency toward their organizations. This tendency is especially evident in the official statements and even statistical data given by the different organizations. Everything is calculated to produce the impression of a perfect situation, and no allowance is made for weak and negative features that we meet in almost every department of social service. In fact it is hard to say what would happen to a social worker if he should dare to bring before the public his doubts as to the real merit of the work in which he is engaged.

The board is responsible for the social worker, and consequently has the right to employ or discharge him. It is a misfortune to have a social worker who is a fixture, who keeps his office on the strength of his past achievements, or through some outside influence, or as a matter of charity. On the other hand, the social worker not merely by virtue of his office, but through efficiency, should assert himself as a leader. The efficient social worker is not the one who does just exactly what the board of managers wants him to do, but the one who is instrumental in making the board demand what he himself thinks ought to be done. All this is true, however, in a general way; in individual cases, the social worker in his relations to the board of managers encounters innumerable difficulties. The board of managers, as a rule, is not a homogenous body, human beings differ, especially when they are members of a philanthropic organization. The position of a social worker is exceedingly difficult when his organization is divided into factions; these differences are hard to reconcile. Both

parties, if there are only two, may be at fault, the entire animosity may be of a personal origin or based upon petty ambition and rivalry. The social worker is placed in the position of a politician, he watches the market and observes each movement of the pendulum of social achievements of one party or the fall of the other. Woe to the social worker who is obliged to flatter, gossip, to lead intrigues and to take advantage of the weaknesses of the individual members of the board. The zeal with which the social worker cultivates his board makes him sometimes forget that the board is, after all, only a small part of the public and that the contributors are also deserving of serious consideration. The favorite of the board is not always the favorite with the public, and, while his position may be quite certain at some time, he is likely to get into some difficulty, and with no co-operation on the part of the community at large will have to stand on his own merit, independently of what the board thinks of him. In settlement work especially, the opinion of the large corps of volunteer workers and so-called sympathizers requires careful handling. Here, as anywhere else, tact and patience are necessary, and a little politeness is always in place. A certain duty devolves upon the social worker in regard to the supporters and contributors. His work depends upon their interests and, therefore, it is very important that he should do all he possibly can to acquaint the public with the manifold activities; their workings should present facts that promote sympathy, enthusiasm and belief not only in the methods, but in the people, for whose benefit the institutions exist.

The tendency on the part of the charity worker to emphasize the faults of the poor, speak of their deceiving natures and of their depravity and of the dire ingratitude, is a wrong means to get the proper co-operation from the organization. An organization based upon hatred and distrust of the people, who are its beneficiaries, even if thoroughly organized, does not deserve the name of charity. The charity worker who sentences every applicant as a thief and liar is unable to do justice even to the deserving individual. The charity worker who thinks that his sole duty is to protect the community from impostors is laboring under a false conception of true charity. With him the problem seems to be



"how to refuse," not "how to help." The board of managers may be curious to know the peculiar and, at times, very morbid experiences with the undeserving poor. This is a weakness similar to the love for detective stories, but this will never serve the cause of charity. The social worker should use all possible opportunities to present the true conditions under which "the other half lives," explain the causes of poverty that are beyond the control of the individual, and he should endeavor to get the sympathy for the suffering and excite the desire to be helpful to the unfortunate. He should cite examples of definite results achieved through adequate relief, and, in general, act as an enthusiastic advocate in behalf of the poor. In doing so he may encounter a good deal of opposition and criticism, but as long as there is no question as to sincerity he is bound to achieve his purpose.

This brings us to the final and the most important consideration, and that is, the relation between the social worker and the beneficiaries, the applicants for charity, the inmates of the institution and the constituency of the settlements. The idea that a social worker is always misjudged by the people among whom he is working is the most dangerous point of view. Many a board doubts the efficiency of its workers, because the latter are on too intimate terms with their charges. Often the hatred shown to the social worker is taken as an indication of his wonderful achievements. No matter how important it is to get friendly relations from the board of managers and the large list of contributors, the social worker must never forget that his mission is among the poor and the needy, the ignorant and the lowly, those that need his assistance, his just and kind attitude.

In relief work the social worker must never forget that he is a paid agent, that he is placed for the purpose of ameliorating the conditions of the needy, that he is called upon primarily to serve the poor, and should never permit himself to play the role of a benefactor. He must give a chance to every applicant to explain to him fully his needs and desires; he must never shirk his responsibility and avoid meeting an applicant whom he cannot or does not want to help. In granting assistance or refusing to do anything for an applicant, he acts in a business capacity; his per-

sonal likes and dislikes should find no place in the matter of distributing relief. All applicants should be treated courteously, friendly and with doubtless sincerity. Kind and forgiving, the social worker should, however, be definite in his actions, decisive and straightforward. Nothing annoys the poor more than the double-faced policy; the social worker need not rehearse in a mirror a smiling countenance, the poor will not believe him. Nor will it be of any purpose to put on a mask of dignity, unnecessary sagacity or stern character, the poor are not easily deceived. The social worker who is really interested in the welfare of the beneficiaries, the social worker who gives thought to each and every case with the view of doing the very best, the social worker who knows what is needed for the community and is frank and fearless in putting his ideas into practice, the social worker who sympathizes with the suffering and never goes back on his promises, will have no trouble to adjust his relations with the people for whom he works.

#### DISCUSSION.

MISS WIENER: The formal discussion of this paper will be opened by Mr. Montefiore Bienenstock, of St. Louis.

By MONTEFIORE BIENENSTOCK,  
ST. LOUIS, MO.

My appearance before you this afternoon reminds me of the story of the negro who, when asked to change a ten-dollar bill, said: "Ah haven't got the change, boss, but Ah thanks you for the compliment." I also thank you for the compliment of offering me the privilege of presenting my humble views; and while I haven't the full change in return for your expectations I'll give you the best I can by way of discussing Dr. Bogen's splendid paper.

Once upon a time a lady gave her son Willie a chameleon. The next day she called the boy and asked: "How's the chameleon, Willie?" To which Willie answered: "The chameleon is all broke up." "Broke up! Why, Willie, how is that?" "Oh!" he said, "this morning I put it on my brown coat and it turned brown; in the afternoon I put it on my blue trousers and it turned blue, and this evening I put it on my Dolly Varden sash and it broke up."

The social worker is a great deal like this chameleon in reference to trying to please all the members of his board. It is his business to have a color of his own on all the important questions, and not merely to try to reflect the opinions of each member of the board. The chameleon policy is the beginning of a "break up" for him in his work. Of course, he must get the general opinion and desire of those for whom he works, but he must carry out their ideas in his own way, and must also give opinions and thoughts of his own on the facts of his work for the board to carry out. He is, therefore, at once a leader and a follower—a reality and a reflection. But he cannot be a chameleon, and change with every viewpoint to the color of the cloth worn by individual members of his board. He must become recognized as a social leader, as well as a follower, and the right arm of men and women with ideas in which he concurs for social benefit. Just how to do this is the question each social worker must solve for himself. A few remarks along the lines of this question are highly apropos.

Miss Kate Barnard, Charity Commissioner of Oklahoma, a young woman of rare enthusiasm and ideals, came into my office about five years ago, and remarked, among other things: "Mr. Bienenstock, it is a great pleasure to meet you, because you are doing so much for 'civilization' and 'humanity.'" I answered: "Miss Barnard, I do not know 'civilization' or 'humanity,' at least in the aggregate. I know these terms in general, but my knowledge is of individuals and not abstractions."

The charity worker must realize this at the outset. He must know men, women and children personally, and not in the mass, though such knowledge comes later, and for purposes of statistics is not to be ignored. The social worker must also know his community, the rich members of it as well as the poor. For him this community—and this includes the idea of it as a municipality—must indeed be a profound study. A social worker who never looks beyond his office walls in the alleviation or amelioration to which he is pledged and privileged is no social worker in the sense I mean at all. He becomes a dead issue, and drops into decay and oblivion that usually follows. In fact, he even clogs the energies of the community which depends on him for outlook and viewpoint on many topics that come within his scope. Such a charity

worker has missed his place, and deserves to be looked upon in the manner so ably set forth by Dr. Bogen.

But the social worker of today means so much more than the mere man who dispenses alms or deals out dollars or doughnuts. In a convention of this kind, or in life in general, there is a curious tendency to think charity a thing apart. It is not. It is not the segregation of ideas or people, but rather the promotion of all things that will disseminate each. Charity means much more than that which is locked in the social worker's brain and bosom. It is general and universal. There is one point in Dr. Bogen's paper, and only one, that touched the point I have in mind. I don't know that I can quote the exact words, but here is the substance: "That it is only a question of time when charity, which is now taken out of the hands of the individual and put in the control of the organization, will become entirely a municipal function." This rings true, and is in line with progressive thought. Wherever a charity office works hand in hand with the Police Department—not merely to arrest people, though to help justice must always be a large part of charity, but to work with the municipal authorities for the relief of distress in its various forms—there will the social worker attain his highest success. In fact, the true social worker should study the statutes of his city, and ought to have a general knowledge of law as well. He should also know various legislators, and have a current knowledge of general legislation, especially on subjects that interest him. In this way the social worker can come into the fullest realization of his powers for benefit.

This is the first time I know of that the social worker has been brought into limelight, individually, at a public conference. It is meet and proper that social work should be ranked among the professions, though the word vocation, as applied in this connection, seems a better term; as containing less lip and more heart expression, and real activity. Profession implies something by which we earn a living; vocation implies choice and life work. But a quibble on words is not in order.

The mistake made by so many social workers is the idea that their work removes them in anywise from the ordinary scheme of

things, or people who are engaged in other pursuits. The social worker must not differentiate himself. Nor must he deem his work of such vital consequence that it must obsess every moment of his waking and sleeping hours. Social work is a tremendous strain, and the nerve-racking tension of the day must be mitigated by pleasures, such as all men enjoy, when the worker has time for leisure. No work that I know is so apt to prey on the mind as well as the other faculties, to the extent of rendering the worker entirely unfit for the zeal, earnestness and enthusiasm which must always be his for the best accomplishment. However, this does not mean that the social worker must keep his work always at the office. Some people think social workers bores if they discuss their work too frequently—in fact, that is just what they are. But there is a wise rule in all things, and the social worker must discuss his work after hours; must discuss it persistently with those whom he wants to help in the causes in which lies his heart.

As I said before, the social worker must be much more than a mere alms doer. The details and multiplicity of ideas that flow into him are necessarily to be utilized in every possible way. And they must be studied and digested very carefully, and discussed dispassionately for the acquisition of the best results. This requires the reading of the current literature and books devoted to social uplift. Every newspaper item connected with or about charity work is of interest for knowledge and study. Financial questions and problems are of especial interest for him, and economic conditions must be food for serious reflection.

Members of charity boards ought also to educate themselves just as must the paid social worker. No good work can be done by anyone, even if he attends meetings regularly, if he does not make some attempt to master the questions up for solution. There are some cases where vanity and mere desire for public notoriety make men serve on charity boards. This should be discouraged and frowned upon. The worker must become the thinker. Nor must the board member merely ride hobbies at the expense of general work done. A harmonious fulfillment of ideals and ideas, or an approximation thereof, is the desideratum. In fact, sacrifice of personal wishes is often necessary to the better solution of gen-



eral problems. The most important, and the thing within practical scope, is the duty of the board as a whole.

Now to return to the paid worker. He must not think he knows it all, any more than any individual board member should have a similar thought. In many cases it is better for him to be merely like the little boy who said he was a director in the bank because he directed the mail. When good ideas are presented to him it is not only his duty, but to his decided interest to carry them out willingly, and even when necessary do the very drudgery of it all. If people who serve on boards, and social workers who carry out the work, either initiated by board members or themselves, know their business, the greatest benefits will accrue. But here is the point: the question of prevention is the main problem of charity. The remedial end of it is much easier, though in itself presents overwhelming difficulties. Prevention and remedy take brains and practical sense. These come through observation, study and serious thought, if they come at all. And this leads to the idea of charity in general.

I stated before, that it is not a thing apart. It belongs to everyday life. You cannot write merely with words, nor build a house merely of brick and stone. You build four walls and call it a home, or a club, or a charity building, a depot, or whatever name its purpose has. It is your thought of it that consecrates it. It is your idea of charity, too, that makes it. And charity is of the home, the parlor, the kitchen, and the rest of the house. It is not merely an office term, a fad, a folly, and an excuse for the expression of hypocritical, or even genuine impulses. It must be common to the social worker, and all the members of his board, toward each other, and the entire community. It has a higher meaning than the mere dispensing of funds. It means kindness, courtesy, consideration and good-will. It also means common sense, and its application to the little problems, as well as the greater ones, of life. If members of boards will realize this in their relation with the paid social workers: that charity is sympathy and good-will; that each one, whether he be a business-man, a lawyer, doctor, architect or mechanic, is in himself a social worker, and necessarily must be; much will be accomplished. The social

worker must also fully realize this in all his attitudes, not by practice and forethought, but, as with all the others, because of life training in gentility and refinement of feeling to all around him. Charity in this sense must be promulgated or inculcated among the rich as well as the poor. If this spirit prevails there can be no friction, nor can the question of the relationship of the social worker to his organization be one entitled to more than mere passing comment.

MR. CHESTER J. TELLER, New Orleans: I can understand how this subject, the relations of social workers to their boards, might be a very interesting and entertaining subject for the Section of Social Workers had they had a little private meeting of their own. It surely is a subject of great importance. It is one which both the successful and the unsuccessful social worker might find very interesting, and one, too, which might bring out some very interesting reminiscences. But, Miss Chairman, and ladies and gentlemen, I really can't see why, in a gathering of this sort, where there is some real work to be done, where we meet only once in two years, for earnest, active, serious work, we should give ourselves over to such an unprofessional subject as the relation of the social worker to his organization. I am under the impression this subject was brought into the program this afternoon for the express purpose of elevating the tone of our profession, and I don't know of anything more lacking in dignity, more unprofessional than the open and official statements that have been made here on this platform in regard to the social worker and his organization.

I consider this subject purely a matter of interest and importance between the social worker in each case and his organization in each case. If we are to take up the time of our society we ought to do it in the proper way. We have to ascertain first how many of our social workers have given their time and gone into their work and made special studies by which they have equipped themselves for their profession. We have, secondly, to persuade persons of high intelligence to go into the profession and to study as the rabbis do, as the lawyers or medical men do.

It doesn't elevate the tone of our profession in the slightest degree to come here and speak of the boards with which we have

been in relation, or the boards with which some of our colleagues have been connected.

I believe tht this subject ought to take a more serious tone, if we are to get any good out of it. I feel that whether we have been successful or not that depends largely upon ourselves; that our relations are purely one of individual capacity; that they are relations for which we are altogether responsible.

After all, there isn't a field worth while in the world, where earnest minds don't have to come in conflict with other minds, where they don't have to meet emergencies in administration, solve knotty difficulties with other people. That man who attributes his failure to the ingratitude of his constituents, or the trouble he has had with a board, or to the fact that others misunderstand him, why that man is simply a failure. In every case where we are dealing with large problems and where we have real work to do, it's a part of our work to make other people understand us. It is part of our work to succeed in spite of difficulties, and to be indeed even grateful for the difficulties we encounter in the administration of our duties.

REV. RUDOLPH I. COFFEE, Pittsburg: If I may quote a well-known phrase of Jacob A. Riis, I should say that these discussions prove how little one-half knows about how the other half acts and lives. Our discussions lack point for this reason, and we would accomplish more were we better acquainted with the facts on both sides. On Tuesday afternoon, some person at the Conference on Dependent Children wanted to know why the Jewish people do not take up farming. I explained to the audience, mostly Christians, that the speaker was quite mistaken, for the Jews, increasingly in number, are becoming farmers. The various agencies were outlined, and I told of the good work that is being accomplished in several of our States. I was greatly surprised that so few members of this Conference were acquainted with these details. One of our leading workers doubted my word, yet this very morning a committee came here, representing, out of the Jewish people of St. Louis, twenty-seven prospective farmers, who are eager to purchase a splendid plot of ground in Eastern Illinois. In every large city you will find a strong desire, among our Jewish people,

to get out of the crowded centers and move to the farm. Yet I am surprised, beyond measure, at the lack of knowledge shown by our Jewish people, and even social workers, about this movement.

Another example may be observed in the discussion held this morning. We observe that Jewish workers are defending the system of placing dependent children in large buildings or institutions, while our Christian workers have given up this method because they have found better ways to provide for children. Massachusetts, for a quarter of a century, has boarded out children in private homes. At least eight States are successfully doing this work, yet this morning we heard the remark made that the system of boarding out children is yet in the experimental stage. Two years ago, eleven societies caring for dependent children in Southern California gave up the institution plan and formed an agency for placing children in board. What has been discarded by the Christians as out of date, was accepted as good enough by our Jewish people, who started soon after in Los Angeles an Orphan Asylum for Jewish Children.

And, finally, another example of this unwillingness to understand the other side is observed in this present discussion. You have just heard it stated that it is unworthy of this Conference to discuss the relation between the social worker and the board, but I say no subject is more vital. It would be instructive, though not pleasant reading, to know just how many social workers are unable to put their whole souls into their work, because of friction with the board. There are three resident workers in Pittsburg leaving their positions this month, because of this inability to work in harmony with their boards. Boards of institutions have been called "planks of ignorance," and the trained worker should be aided to work with these directors in harmony. Would it not be a splendid contribution if something could be done to bring a better spirit of relationship between the worker and his board? Our discussion should aim to bring about a closer feeling of friendship, more harmony and less strife. Accomplishing so much, this year, our discussion will not be in vain.

MR. CYRUS L. SULZBERGER: May I say just a word on behalf of the kid-glove class of ignoramus?

I think Mr. Teller spoke more wisdom in two minutes than we have heard here in the entire discussion. As in all other walks of life, all the dissatisfaction throughout creation depends upon yourself, not upon any outside influences. That social worker, or that broker, or that scrub-woman, that rabbi or that blacksmith, who is trying to hold his place by pull deserves to lose it, and probably will. That employe in any walk in life who is looking first to cut a figure with his employer instead of performing his labor never will succeed. There is no profound philosophy in this. Your duty you must do, and as one of the kid-glove philanthropists I tell you the board will appreciate it. Cut the figure, and the board will recognize. That is a very simple proposition.

The relationship between the social worker and the boards of directors of all the organizations I have been connected with have always been fortunate. We have had no time to appreciate that they were our inferiors, as were here offered today. I am glad to have learned. That is one idea at least, one item of information that I can carry home to my associates and tell them that it is the judgment of the Jewish charity workers of the United States that they do not regard themselves as the partners of the boards of directors.

DR. BOGEN: As a matter of personal privilege, I take the liberty of speaking again. I do not intend to take up the subject anew.

I can readily appreciate the sentiment of one of the speakers, that success or failure depends upon the qualifications of the person in question. I thought so myself when I was young. But eventually, when you come in contact with the different boards, you begin to appreciate that there are other factors of success outside of personal merit. Every social worker knows that many a sleepless night is spent in thinking over the difficulties with the directors. It is a blessing when a person happens to work with a good board. Mr. Sulzberger is, however, not a representative of the average board member. There are only a few that are of his caliber. I could get along with Mr. Sulzberger without any difficulty.

As a rule, however, a social worker cannot depend upon fair treatment. A superintendent of an orphan asylum, for instance,



being young and enthusiastic, may express opinions that are too radical. He is liable to lose his position, he may be discharged by a committee, and not because he is not qualified, but because the board did not appreciate his endeavors. The directors, on the other hand, are not supposed to be passive. Proper criticism and expression of different views should be appreciated, but let the professional worker have his chance. I believe it does good for the social workers to be frank—let the employer know our own opinion of our own inefficiency, but let him know also that we have the right to judge our work. There is no reason why the social worker should not discuss his work as any other professional worker.

There was a time when the rabbis took possession of the platform of the Conference, and we never had a chance to say a word; now we have gained some ground, let us keep it and let us not be afraid that it will hurt our "dignity."

CHAIRMAN WIENER: A paper has been interpolated on the program, and we will now listen to Mr. Folk Younker.

Mr. Folk Younker, Secretary of the New York Young Men's Hebrew Association, thereupon read the following paper:

#### WORK OF THE Y. M. H. A. OF NEW YORK.

By FALK YOUNKER,

NEW YORK, N. Y.

The activities of the Y. M. H. A. of New York are to a large extent modeled after that splendid institution, the Y. M. C. A. About sixty years ago this latter association was organized for the purpose of keeping young men within the church, and away from the lowering tendencies of city life. Built upon a religious foundation, this institution has maintained its standard and increased its prestige so that today it is a world-wide association, which receives liberal support and conducts a multitude of man-building activities.

Thirty-six years ago the Y. M. H. A. of New York was founded. The need was already felt in those days for an organization around which young men could rally for mental, moral, social and physical development. In its early days it had as its foremost workers

such men as Oscar S. Straus, Judge Greenbaum, Judge Platzek, David Leventritt, Henry M. Leipziger, Daniel P. Hayes and many others of equal prominence. These men to this day recall with pride and gratitude the training they received as active members of the Association in the formative period of their careers.

The value of an institution like the Y. M. H. A., besides teaching loyalty to faith, lies in its possibility of developing social workers, who, by their training, their ability and their Jewish fervor, are fitted to take up the many problems which confront the community and help in their solution. In a city the need of such a character-building association is strongly felt. The degrading influences of the saloon, the street-corner, the low-grade dance hall and theater must be overcome. But even in the smaller towns, where twenty or more Jewish young men associate, such societies should be established, in order that our youth may be led to take a live and intelligent interest in Jewish as well as civic affairs, and actively participate in all matters which concern the well-being of their city.

A Y. M. H. A. must be so conducted as to gain for it the respect and support of all good citizens. It must be looked upon as a force for good in the community. Its aim should be higher than that of a mere social club, though its work must necessarily be, to a large extent, of a social nature. The mission of the organization must, however, be kept steadfast in mind. No community should permit the name of the Y. M. H. A. to be used unless the leaders devote their time and energy to building up an association that will stand for Judaism, for patriotism and for brotherhood. The great success of the Y. M. H. A. may be summed up in a few words: Earnestness, enthusiasm and devotion to high ideals.

On the 30th of this month it will be exactly ten years since the present fully equipped home of the New York Association was dedicated. This building is situated at the corner of 92d Street and Lexington Avenue, and is the generous gift of Mr. Jacob H. Schiff. Since its opening the membership has increased from 800 to over 3,500; the annual attendance from 60,000 to over 200,000; annual receipts and expenditures from \$12,000 to nearly \$40,000. One of the main activities is an employment department, which is

non-sectarian. Last year over 1,200 positions were secured for deserving young men. An evening school is conducted. The attendance is composed mainly of working boys, sixteen years and upward, who have been obliged to leave school before completing their education. The principal subjects taught are: Penmanship, stenography, preparatory business and advanced commercial courses, civil service, mechanical drawing, civics, English to foreigners, English and debating, Spanish, French and German. Last year over 400 young men attended these classes.

The Association maintains a public reference library and reading-room. The library contains over 12,000 standard volumes.

The attendance last year was over 35,000. Lectures and entertainments are frequently held. These consist of addresses by prominent speakers, prize debates and elocution contests, given by the young men. A series of health talks is arranged each season and conducted by well-known physicians. Chanukah and Purim plays are given yearly. One of the senior clubs of the building conducts a civic forum; public men and city officials deliver the addresses and answer questions put to them by those who attend. The talent secured for the various affairs is always high-class, and it is gratifying to observe how young people can be taught to appreciate entertainments of a refined character.

A series of grand rally meetings is also held during the winter, to which young men from all parts of the city are invited, regardless of membership in the Association. Heart-to-heart talks are given on practical and ethical topics, and these are well attended. A short entertainment is also arranged in connection with these affairs. The attendance ranges from 400 to 700. Religious services are conducted every Friday evening, arranged specially for young people. The various clubs of the buildings are represented at the services, and members take turns in occupying a seat on the platform and reading one of the weekly prayers. A trained choir of children's voices, selected from the Hebrew Free School, helps to make the service very inspiring. The weekly attendance ranges from 250 to 500. Our ministers and laymen encourage this work by responding to our invitations to deliver weekly addresses.

A Hebrew school was started a few years ago to provide religious instruction to the poor children in the neighborhood. The school fills a long-felt want, and the attendance is so large that the school is divided into two divisions, each section meeting twice weekly. The children receive a thorough training in Hebrew and religion. Nearly 600 children attend.

Sabbath afternoon services, arranged specially for children, are held weekly.

Services are held on the high Holy Days, which the young men of the Association and their parents and relatives attend. The gymnasium, of course, is a very attractive feature of the work, and is the means of interesting a large number of young men. This department is under the direction of a competent physical director. Classes meet every night in the week, except Friday and Sunday, and nearly 500 young men are enrolled.

The summer vacation camp is also maintained to enable working boys to spend their vacation amid healthful surroundings.

The fees for the above privileges are moderate, and within the reach of all worthy young men.

The above is a brief outline of the work of some of the principal activities. The directors of the Association are anxious to spread a knowledge of this work, so that other cities may profit by the experience of the parent association. Information, giving all details, will be cheerfully furnished at all times.

In conclusion, let me quote from the address of Rev. Dr. Samuel Schulman, delivered at the thirty-fifth anniversary exercises, held last year. Dr. Schulman is one of the directors of the Association:

#### SOCIAL INFLUENCE.

"The Y. M. H. A. seeks to equip young men with power by providing them with the proper environments for recreation. It supplements the home by giving them a second home, under whose roof are grouped all the opportunities of a complete and many-sided recreation, interpreted in the most comprehensive spirit. And it is in recreation that men's moral power is generated. What a man's possibilities of attainment for himself may be, he seeks

in his working hours. What he really is as a character and of what service he can be to his fellow-men, he shows in his recreations. What a man is in character I cannot discover by the amount of money he makes. I get nearer to this by seeing how he spends that money. It is, therefore, important what a man's recreation is; if it is in the saloon or in the gambling den it is no recreation, but simply a continuation of the fever and greed which possess us in our daily tasks.

#### MISSION OF THE ASSOCIATION.

"What we need is a Judaism that shall be modern, liberal, religious and loyal to the great distinctive Jewish institutions and Jewish symbols which are the indispensable expressions of the Jewish spirit and the Jewish ideals. The function of the Y. M. H. A. is to train a generation of young men who will thus be liberal and loyal Americans and Jews, and who will be able, without losing their Jewish individuality, to work shoulder to shoulder with Christianity for the moral and spiritual building up of the American people in the great work which Israel, as a priest people, is doing in the service of humanity."

CHAIRMAN WIENER: "Social Work as a Profession," by Mr. Louis H. Levin, Federated Jewish Charities, Baltimore, Md.

#### SOCIAL WORK AS A PROFESSION.

By LOUIS H. LEVIN,

Secretary Federated Jewish Charities,

BALTIMORE, MD.

We hear the term "scientific charity" so often that it were not surprising if the public came to think of the professional social worker as a kind of scientist, with his microscope, laboratory and long and dull lectures. Indeed, the social worker has, in effect, all of these, but he is, nevertheless, so far as his calling is concerned, not a scientist, and science cannot be properly predicated of his subject. Scientific charity should rather be systematized



charity, for the professional worker is really a systematizer, and his task is, today, to establish a system of financial, social and educational assistance, which will adequately meet our needs, and which will properly supplement the industrial and commercial system dominating modern life.

Our charities and philanthropies are not so old that many of us cannot remember their evolution in administration and management. First came the small society, taking care of the sporadic case, local or transient. The methods were simple. Money was collected by a figurative passing of the hat, and the applicant received the proceeds. On favorable occasions the collection proved a veritable windfall to the beneficiary; again, if his *mazel* was not up to the standard, the returns were small, and the applicant would be correspondingly disappointed. There were no investigations, no records. The ability to tell a strong, pathetic story was a valuable asset. Men traveled all over the country on no other capital than a moving tale of woe. Many are able still to go through the same performance.

As communities grew and applicants increased, the necessity for a regularly gathered fund and a formal place for distribution became evident. Officers and directors made their appearance, and a voluntary secretary wrote letters, drew checks, and read minutes to a watchful board. The boast was that all money collected was given away; printing was begged, and postage came out of directors' pockets. Giving became more a matter of calculation, for if there was only a circumscribed and definite amount to be distributed, care had to be taken that no one received more than his share. The central place for distribution soon brought out the fact that an applicant of today had made his first appearance before, and a heated discussion at times arose whether the memory of the secretary or a director was to be trusted or whether the indignant protestations of the applicant were to prevail.

Up to this time all is voluntary work, and the test of efficiency is the small amount spent for expenses. But the community grows, more people apply for aid, and, whereas before nearly every applicant, not a stranger, was known to a director of the association, now there comes an increasing number, of whom the whole board

is ignorant. The language they speak is beginning to be unintelligible, and they arrive at all hours of the day. At last we have reached a period when it is necessary to have someone on guard every day to receive applicants, and occasionally to find out whether they are telling the truth. For, while all of us occasionally lapse from the strict letter of the law, the applicant caught in a fib is a doomed man. At this point the paid secretary makes his appearance.

Of course, no one would think of paying the secretary a living salary. That would be taking the bread out of the mouths of the poor, and the secretary was the only poor man that the relief society did not think it ought to bother about. He was generally a kindly, elderly person, who could read and write fairly well, and who could put down on paper a letter dictated by the president, without errors of the flagrant sort. The directors continue to direct. They feel that they are entitled to their share of influence, and want their particular wards taken care of as well as the wards of the other directors. About this time the annual meeting of the society looms up as an intellectual communal occasion, and the presidential address is born. It is now quite a social success to appear as the presiding officer of the chief Jewish relief society, and the mayor of the city has to listen to the official presidential discourse.

But the community continues to grow. Applicants with a thousand and one complaints appear; the board is beginning to feel restless under the continual doling out of money without visible results, and it is tired, too, of running down all the stories the applicants tell. A suspicion dawns upon directors that you cannot "size a man up" by merely looking at him; a "cute," plausible fellow has deceived the shrewdest member, and, finally, the secretary is asked to devote some of his leisure time examining into things, and his salary goes up a peg. At last, all his time is taken up—he receives about enough to keep soul and body together, and, behold, our first Jewish professional worker!

With this beginning the rest is easy. The duties of the office outgrow the services of one person. Other salaried agents have to be added, and their entire time consumed. Budgets increase, a

greater and greater amount is distributed, and directors and contributors begin to expect the same care and expertness in distributing this fund as is displayed in regular and orderly business houses. A budget of \$1,500 may be distributed without professional frills, but when it rises to \$15,000 and \$20,000 and even to \$25,000, the need of a man of affairs to distribute it is no longer a matter of dispute. Not only is there the question of *Who*, but also of *How* and *What*. The board can no longer go into details; someone with experience, judgment and knowledge is needed—a man or woman who gives all his or her time and thought to the affairs of the association, and who is adequately paid for the service. Thus, the *profession* of the social worker is created, and men and women begin to qualify for its demands and duties.

Now, no profession can exist that does not require of those who take it up both training and study, and it is the latter that differentiates the professional worker of today from the unprofessional worker of a few years ago, or even of today, for all of us in social and philanthropic work cannot be said to be professionals. Study also means an entirely different attitude toward work and toward the problem it presents. It means the gathering of facts, and the patient and intelligent interpretation of them. It means new apprehensions, wider grasp; it means, finally, a pursuit of the elements of dependence into the domain of history, economics and civics, and a more intelligent co-ordination of effort toward the result sought, with a better understanding of what is ultimately desirable and possible.

The Jews have not, it must be admitted, grasped the implications of professional social work as readily as one would have expected, judging from their keen and eager interest in social and philanthropic questions. Dr. Boris D. Bogen, in his valuable monograph on the "Extent of Jewish Philanthropy in the United States," states that 489 of 1,191 institutions mentioned in the American Jewish Year Book, 1907-1908, expended \$4,779,611 the previous year. It would be quite within reason to say that today no less than \$6,000,000 a year (Mr. Bogen puts it at \$10,000,000) is spent by Jewish relief societies, institutions, settlements and other similar organizations. This is a vast sum, and it needs no argu-

ment to convince one that it requires skill of a high order to distribute it so that it will do good. To do the greatest good would tax the ingenuity of our ablest organizing geniuses. Dr. Bogen was able to discover only 73 "Paid Workers" responsible for the distribution of this vast sum. His statistics are confessedly incomplete, but they indicate that the paid worker is not nearly so plentiful as he should be. Indeed, unless we can supplement these 73 with a goodly number, of whom he has no account, our charities will not appear so progressive and intelligently conducted as we are in the habit of thinking they are.

A paid worker, as I have said, is not necessarily a professional worker—he may dabble in charity or philanthropy as a side issue, and pick up a few extra dollars. Or he may devote his whole time to his present work, waiting an opportunity for something better to turn up, in an entirely different field. The professional worker deserving of the name is one who is permanently committed to the vocation of the social worker. He thinks in terms of his calling, studies how it may be improved and become more valuable to the community he serves; how it can be enlarged and turned to fresh uses; finally, how he can equip himself for the greater work. To the society that engages him he becomes a source of information and instruction. The expedients and experience of other cities he brings to his board, adapted to local conditions, and he is an expert adviser in all it intends to do. We can see the effect of his work in the Jewish field, especially in our large child-caring institutions, where much of the progress has been due to the efficiency and resourcefulness of the professional worker; in our educational institutions; in settlements, and, finally, in relief work, where, I believe, the professional impress has been slowest to make its mark, probably because this is the most difficult field in which to make experiments and carry them through successfully.

One of his most important functions is to educate his board up to present standards. This is said in no boastful sense, but as a logical outcome of his position, his training, and his opportunities. The average director cannot keep pace with the ever-changing aspects of special work. If he reads an article now and then to keep informed in a general way on the social subject in which he

is interested, he is pretty sure to get a distorted idea of its applicability to his own institution, unless his opinion is toned down by the professional worker to suit the particular case. For instance, settlement work among Jews is not what it is among non-Jews. Some of its ideas have universal validity, others must be adapted before we can adopt them, or abandoned altogether. Friendly visiting among us is quite a different thing from what it is among our non-Jewish neighbors. A director, who happens to read up on these subjects, may get on the wrong track altogether, if there is not at hand a man who understands the principles of settlement work and friendly visiting, and who knows also what would be the result of applying those principles unchanged to a Jewish community. I maintain that it takes a professional or trained worker even to tell whether an association is doing useful or harmful work.

But it is to the training of the completely uninformed director that the trained worker is of greatest assistance. By an enlightening presentation of actual conditions and a convincing demonstration of a plan to meet them he may train a director to see things from the social point of view; he may wean him from the application of business principles to every human activity. For just as the lawyer regards the problems of his profession from the legal point of view, and the doctor his from the medical point of view, so the professional social worker contemplates his field in its social aspect, and it is only in this attitude that he can correctly grasp the particular end it is his duty to achieve. Every director brought to view the social world through this vista becomes a new social force in the community, attains to a deeper conception of our complex life, increases his value to the organization he manages and to the city in which he lives, and adds one more man to that growing number of social students who are bound in time to affect profoundly our whole commercial and civic life.

The opportunity thus presented to the social worker is of great significance and of unlimited usefulness. That he has his troubles now, no one will deny. Very often his board, instead of meekly taking instructions, are bent on giving some themselves, and will see them carried out or know the reason why. Then, the community has not entirely freed itself from the feeling that a man



who will devote himself to the administration of charity cannot be much better than those who receive it, and they have a mild pity for whoever take up this line of endeavor. The Jewish social worker generally has little social standing. In this respect we do not follow the custom of the *goyim*, among whom the profession of the social worker is as highly regarded as any other. We need only look at the National Conference of Charities and Corrections, which will gather here in a few days, to see the position that has been reached by the professional social worker, to understand to what dignity that profession has attained, and to see, also, how far Jewish social workers have to travel before the same dignity shall be theirs. The non-Jewish workers have obtained their position by brilliant achievement in constructive philanthropy, by a leadership at once intelligent, enlightened and effective, and their contribution to modern social ideas and expedients is universally acknowledged. The Jewish social worker can at least hope to share in this program of useful progress, if it be too much to expect him to make a like contribution to theoretical and practical charity administration.

The Jewish professional social worker has before him now an ever-widening sphere of usefulness. The problems of Jewish child-caring are of the greatest importance, and they call for the skilled specialist, of the highest professional type. The dignity and salary of the office are enough to draw into service men of conspicuous ability, and the future presents a career in this calling that no one can afford to despise. In settlement or social work proper the ground has not even been broken. One or two institutions have developed activities which have attracted the attention of the general public, but the whole question is open, awaiting the coming of the man with insight, imagination and constructive ability. Honor and emolument are ready for him, and there is no other profession which offers so ready recognition as awaits the competent Jewish social worker. Of Jewish hospitals and homes, nothing shall be said, for I do not think they present any conspicuous phenomena, though they offer work in abundance, require skill and return the satisfaction that one expects from the practice of an honorable profession. In relief work we are ready

for decided progress, for the involved problems of dependence, with all their ramifications, from giving doles to training refractory children to become wage-earners and home supporters, present a fascinating study for the trained mind, and put one into active touch with those forces which, we are prone to think, are making for a better and a higher humanity. At the present moment the call for the worker exceeds the number who are ready to respond, and here at last we have found one modern profession which is not overcrowded.

Perhaps the largest problem of organization that confronts the Jewish social worker today is the harmonizing of the older charities with those of a later immigration. The difficulties in the way I would not minimize. They represent two different states of culture and experience, and the rule in this matter is, that an organization prefers to learn by its own mistakes rather than profit by the mistakes of others. However, a *modus vivendi* can be and must be worked out. We must not only harmonize our charities, but must weld them into a strong and consistent whole, so that they become an instrument of real power. To accomplish this end we need qualities of intellect, reinforced by training and experience, quite in as high a degree as is needed for the solution of any other of our problems. Among no other people, I believe, is there a similar situation. With all our solidarity, we are divided, and divided on a subject upon which at heart we are, so to speak, all of one mind. Let the professional social worker look to this as the one great achievement that lies directly before him.

When our communities shall have become compact and harmonious wholes, the next step is to marshall this force in behalf of all movements making for the common good. There is no activity of general benefit that does not need the help the Jews can give it, and which cannot be helped by our organized effort. Whether it is the movement for better housing conditions, for better infant feeding, for larger playgrounds, for the prevention of tuberculosis, for an efficient probation system, even for the more intelligent treatment of prisoners and delinquents, the Jews are all interested, and can be of great public service. I cannot do better in trying to give the scope of the effort of the social worker

than by quoting this comprehensive statement of the *Survey*: and big as these things look they are not beyond the concern of and assistance from an organized and harmonized Jewry. He should serve:

a. As interpreter of inter-related social movements—the prevention of tuberculosis, charity organizations, housing reform, civic improvements, etc.

b. As interpreter of civic and social advances in every part of the country to every other part.

c. As interpreter of different groups in society to each other.

d. As interpreter of the social work of the several professions to each other.

e. As interpreter of social invention in industry.

f. As interpreter of movements for the betterment of industrial relations and conditions.

g. As interpreter of social research.

h. As interpreter and advocate of reform and social advance, where none other exists.

i. As quick investigator and interpreter of the facts of living conditions while they are in process rather than after they have happened.

We have not taken the rank in preventive charity that we have attained in relief work, and this condition is due as much to the fact that the Jewish professional worker has been late coming on the scene and in being given the responsibility which should devolve on him, as it is to the historical reason that relief work is the classic form of Jewish help, and has come to us in noble tradition.

Though the number of Jewish professional workers is still small, we can be assured that it will increase rapidly, for the genius of the Jew inclines to professional callings. Efficient schools of philanthropy, in the organization of which Jews have had some but a minor and inadequate part, exist in a number of educational centers, and will increase rapidly; and no school need fear that it will not have its quota of Jewish students. Besides, boards and their supporters are rapidly coming to the point where they will accept only the worker who has adopted social service as a pro-

fession and has trained in the work, for even minor positions; and they have reconciled themselves to the necessity for offering adequate wages to intelligent men and women who have by study and practice rendered themselves qualified to take charge of their institutions. Social work, as a profession, therefore, presents a wide scope for the abilities of strong and well-equipped men and women, with a possibility of large public achievement, which will bring power, influence and renown, and also such a return of a monetary nature as will satisfy the person not bitten by the commercial spirit. This is as true of the Jewish as of the non-Jewish worker, and our young men and women, who crowd the legal, medical, rabbinical and educational schools, might pause a moment to think of another profession, just as useful and honorable, namely, that of social worker.

CHAIRMAN WIENER: The formal discussion will be opened by Rabbi Sidney Goldstein, of New York.

## DISCUSSION.

By RABBI SIDNEY E. GOLDSTEIN,  
Social Service Department, Free Synagogue,  
NEW YORK, N. Y.

I share your appreciation of the paper just read to us by our secretary. There are, however, some comments that may be made without fear of offense—comments in the nature of correction and supplement, rather than in the spirit of unkind criticism.

Mr. Levin, as I understand his paper, devotes himself to and develops three points: First, the evolution of the professional social worker out of the unpaid or underpaid secretary; second, the qualities and qualifications of a professional social worker; third, the opportunities that lie in the hands of a professional social worker as an educational influence in his board and in the community. To these three points is added a postscript, lamenting, in the language of the prophet, the lack of honor accorded the Jewish social worker among his own people. Nowhere is the author in doubt that there does exist such a thing as the profession

of which he speaks. The entire paper, in fact, is based and built upon the assumption that there is in fullness and completeness the profession of social service.

This assumption is, I believe, at least debatable. When we consider the recognized professions: The profession of law, of medicine, of the ministry, we discover that they present two main features: One a large, well-defined body of knowledge, and the other a well-worked-out group of principles. In law there are the codes and the principles of jurisprudence. These the lawyer must learn. In medicine there is anatomy, physiology, pathology, and their branches, and also the principles of *materia medica*. These the physician must know. In the ministry there is the history of religion and the principles of theology. These the minister must master. Is there a corresponding body of knowledge, or a similar group of principles that may be credited to social service? If such a body of knowledge does exist it has not been disengaged or segregated from the general mass of information. If such a group of principles be in our possession they have not been defined or formulated. There is not even what we may reasonably and truthfully call a literature of social service. There are many monographs on a large variety of subjects, social and pseudo-social; there are an unlimited number of medleys on things more or less vitally associated with social problems; but when these works are placed alongside the libraries in law and medicine, the best that can be said of them is that they aspire, and thus far fail. The same thing is true of the schools in which we have been trained—that is, those of us who have had the advantage of any systematic training at all. The longest course offered by any school is eight months. There are summer courses covering six weeks. There are evening courses extending over thirty weeks, with a two hours' session twice each week. I am patiently waiting (somewhat in dread, I confess) for the magazine announcement: How to learn social service in sixty lessons. How do these courses compare with the curriculum and the time demanded by the State of the lawyer and the physician?

It is too early, I am convinced, to expect a solid literature; a firm, organic body of knowledge; or a safe and sustaining set of



principles. The oldest school of philanthropy is still in its childhood. The first professor of social economy was appointed only five years ago. It is premature to assume the honor and dignified title of a profession. If we are not members of a profession, then what are we? This is an embarrassing question, but one that we must answer in all sincerity if we are to understand ourselves and our work. At the best we are students and experimentalists and empiricists. At the worst—perhaps it is better not to say. In a section of social workers, when the boards of most are absent, we ought to be candid enough to confess our weaknesses. The fewest of us are prepared and equipped for positions to which we pilgrimage, and the pathetic fact is that some of us do not seem to appreciate this fact. We approach our problems in the unmitigated assurance of inexperience and inexpertness. In a few months a change takes place. We begin to see ourselves and our problems in proper proportions. The problems begin to expand and we begin to contract. This is a discouraging process to witness and to suffer; but it happens and is wholesome. Later we gradually learn to adjust ourselves to these new conceptions. And then we address ourselves to the study and to the solution, not of the problems, but of the questions that press most urgently and most imperatively upon our attention.

Here appears another weakness: Unconsciously, in some instances consciously, and against our wills, we become specialists. One man lives inside of a settlement; another man lives inside of an orphan asylum; another lives inside a relief agency, and, you will forgive me when I say, that it not infrequently occurs that we grow so occupied with what takes place within the walls that surround us that we soon lose our sense of perspective and fail to see the proper relation that we and our institutions bear to the social whole. In hospital work, in which field I served for over two years, and with which I am most closely acquainted, I know that men and women are bounded in their vision by the buildings in which they live and move and have their being. The hospital to them is a place to which the sick are brought and in which the sick are treated, and also utilized as clinical material. The thought that the hospital is a

social institution, and that as such it has a social function to perform does not interest or disturb them. They fail to see that there is something more to a sick man than his sickness. They neglect to consider that sickness is a symptom of morbid social conditions, or perhaps a danger signal of coming social distress, which social care could prevent. The fact that the man, stretched in pain upon the bed, may be a father; or the woman, moaning in delirium upon a cot, may be a mother; or the tiny, panting, feverish babe in the crib, the precious life-blood of parents—these facts are not their concern.

In a lesser degree, I am convinced from my conversations with social workers, we are all guilty of social myopia—contracted or constricted social vision., We are specialists, but specialists without the advantage of having been previously and wisely general practitioners. This is evidenced by what might be called the referring habit in social work. When a case applies to us for treatment, in which there appears to be an element alien to the particular character of work in which we are engaged, at once we call the stenographer or take up the telephone: "I beg to refer to you Mrs. 'So and So,' whose case comes within the jurisdiction of your institution"; which is another way of saying, "I think I do not understand this case, will you please treat it for me?" We are like the German surgeon, to whom a man went and said: "Professor, I have cut my index finger." "So," said the professor, "index finger; well, you must go to Professor Dactylogissmuss, in the next block; I am a specialist for the middle finger only." More than one of our so-called social institutions and the so-called social workers will have to be resocialized.

This resocialization will come with the coming profession of social service. At present the utmost that we may allow is that our profession is in the process of formation. It is possible to foresee that our body of knowledge will concern itself with the structure of society, with the functioning of the different organs, with the diseases to which the different parts are liable. Our group of principles will consist of the simple ethical laws, expressed and administered in the form of social remedies. When we have possessed ourselves of this body of knowledge, when this group of principles

will have possessed us, we shall win and hold our professional position; and there will be no more lamentations written on the theme of honor withheld or meanly given. Personally, I have no patience with this oft-uttered complaint and wail. I am positive that, if we were as poorly prepared as physicians and lawyers as some of us are equipped as social workers, we should receive and we should merit not more honor, but less; and, in addition to this, we should not be permitted to practice by the State. I make this statement because I love the profession which is coming to be; because I am jealous of the honor and the dignity of the guild to which we trust in time to be admitted as members. And the members, I submit, will be something more than disbursing agents; something more than systematizers of methods; something more than organizers of agencies and institutions. The social worker will consider as his prime purpose and duty the creation, the strengthening, the broadening of the social conscience, because he will realize that in this alone lies the ultimate solution of our social problems. He will show how useless it is to build sanatoria so long as the conscience of the community permits the sweatshop and the tenement; he will teach us how futile it is to contribute to relief agencies so long as we regard the bargain counter as a jest and not as an indictment; he will reveal to our eyes the blood of our brothers splashed upon the very clothing that we wear; he will open our ears to the agonized cries of our sisters that come from the very ornaments with which we decorate ourselves; he will be moved and inspired by a social passion because he loves men, loves them intensely, profoundly, tenderly, as his own.

DISCUSSION—(*Continued*).

By PHILIP L. SEAMAN,

Superintendent of Jewish Educational Alliance,

ST. LOUIS, MO.

I am placed here in a rather peculiar position at the end of this three-yard program; at the time it came to me I was rather surprised that it was not five yards long, for had it been so I might have been placed at the end of that.

The two papers read on the question of social service were somewhat kin to each other. I tried to listen carefully to Mr. Levin's

paper, and took such points for the discussion as seemed to me to warrant the placing of social service work in line with other professions.

Social service is as much a profession as is the study of law, or the study of medicine, or that of engineering. It is very unfair, to my mind, to think even for a moment, that after the many thousands of years of development of the human race and of human energy, after these many thousands of years of struggle, that men of today, who have given most of their lives to social service as those who are represented in this Conference have, should be responsible for saying that social service has as yet not developed into a profession. Such gross inconsistency and injustice is hardly excusable. From a layman who does not understand the sentiments of social service and does not feel its human importance such sentiments might not be surprising.

A hundred years ago, a French thinker recognized social science as one of the most important sciences in the hierarchy of the sciences. He places the social sciences as a development of the fundamental sciences; namely, astronomy, physics, chemistry, biology, etc., showing that after all these pure sciences comes the social science as a natural outgrowth. Up to that time no one had ever schemed the social science. That the phenomena of society of men aggregated in masses were governed by laws as absolute and rigorous as those governing cosmical phenomena was barely suspected, and nothing had been done toward their systematic co-ordination. Comte did not flatter himself that he would be able at once to raise this complimentary branch of positive philosophy to the level of the preliminary sciences.

George Henry Lewis, in his excellent exposition, "The Philosophy of the Sciences," tells us that Comte's wishes were only to set forth the actual possibility of constructing and cultivating social science in the same manner as positive sciences were cultivated and constructed. He defined the real philosophical character of the sciences and established its principle basis. His three reigning doctrines, the theological, the metaphysical and the scientific, in which he shows the natural development and evolution of all mind and matter, he utilizes very ostensibly in the social

sciences. So high an appreciation had Comte for the social sciences that he places them at the end of his hierarchal scheme. The placing of this science last properly puts it first as far as human importance is concerned.

The reason that I call your attention to this fact especially is because of the attitude, conscious or unconscious as it may be, that the writer of this afternoon's paper seems to have on the general subject of social work. Social work does by no means center itself around the relief office only, as we seem to gather from the carefully arranged historical sketch given to us this afternoon by Mr. Levin. We have today the larger conception of social work, and the social worker who has made the work a profession realizes, and if he does not realize should, that much more attention must be paid to the so-called details of this new science, in order to be able to cope with the situations presented in the various forms of social endeavor.

It seems almost impossible to believe that men of thought and experience, men of great learning and keen observation, will make a life-study of the habits, the characters, the form of development, the nature and the history of birds, fish, animals, etc. That thousands, yes, I might almost say millions, of dollars are spent constantly on excavations and expeditions, so that another page might be added to the already voluminous history of ancient times. It seems to me almost illogical that universities and students will spend money and a lifetime in order to find another ruin; feel perfectly delighted with the discovery of a piece of pottery, a stone, a bone of a peculiar shape and form, and fill the scientific magazines of today with theories and suppositions as to what these findings may theoretically mean. These very same universities and professors consider it entirely out of place and unimportant to pay the same time and attention to the habits and environments, social and economic conditions, which so change the real life of the present-day man. They will listen for days to the sound of a bird in order to be able to classify it for the benefit of the student of this science. I wonder why the crying of the babe, left destitute by the cruel and untimely death of its parent, does not elicit equal attention from this scientist.



At last, however, sociology has fought its way and has placed itself on an important pedestal receiving rigorous attention and more careful study, thus giving an opportunity at least to hope of the better day when man, the highest form of all living beings, will be recognized as an important factor in the development and the history of mankind.

Ladies and gentlemen, there seems to me to be another thought that has not sufficiently been spoken of. It seems that, at present, men in all professions, carefully study the causes, and, after ascertaining them, work along constructive lines with a view of doing away with these causes and eliminating the necessity for their professional service.

At the graduation exercises of one of the large institutions in this country, the president of the American Medical Association, in an address, said very truthfully that the mission of the scientific medical men is to do away with the necessity of a doctor by finding out the causes of preventable disease and through education and legislation eliminate them. This same fact, it seems to me, should be true with reference to all professions whose necessity depends upon the existence of purely preventable measures, be they in medicine, in law or in social service. The social worker, whose work and necessity for its performance peculiarly depends upon the existence of measures that are absolutely preventable, should, above all, if he is at all inclined to be scientific, base his entire efforts upon the elimination and extermination of the existence of the causes that bring about his profession a necessity at the present time. In other words, the physician, the lawyer, the minister and the social worker, should make the necessity for their existence as such workers absolutely unnecessary. We social workers should be first to recognize these truths, and I feel that we recognize them; and I feel that our profession has recognized them more so than any of the other professions.

The time is coming, and coming soon, when mankind will realize that there is a duty that each man has to perform to his neighbor; that all men will look upon each other as brothers, when we will cease to see differences of class, of kind, of color, where each one will be a social worker, and when all men will say not, "Am I My

Brother's Keeper?" but "I Am My Brother's Keeper." We are gradually reaching that happy millennium. You heard this afternoon, for instance, of a move in the right direction, about the newer ideas of the child-caring problems, recommendations for the abolition of organized barrack pavilions and even cottage systems for the care of children. We are also told that in the city of Chicago there is a movement on foot, even more radical than this, to abolish the necessity of the day nursery. The logic of all this has come about by a truth which presented itself, namely, that it is very inhuman to take children away from their mother, place them in institutions that cost on the average of \$2.50 a week per capita to maintain, in order to allow the mother to go to work and earn \$4.00 to \$5.00 a week. We are beginning in every way to realize that the unfortunate have a right to live, yes, and a right to live decently. We are also beginning to realize that there is a reason for the maladjustment in our society, that tells a man to live and look after a family on earnings that average \$9.00 a week. We are beginning to realize, all of us, that there is something radically wrong somewhere, and social workers in particular, who are thrown constantly with these truths, begin not to be afraid to expose and talk of them in a more natural and honest way.

Let me tell you something that I heard only a few days ago, which seems characteristic of this very thing that I am speaking about. Mr. Alexander Johnson, Secretary of the National Conference of Charities and Correction, told me the following story: In a large institution in New York there was an opening for the position of superintendent. A young man applied for this position, and from all recommendations and investigations it was found that the young man was the desirable candidate for the position. He was told by the board of directors that they are desirous of his accepting the position in question. The young man before accepting, however, said to the board of directors at their meeting: "Gentlemen, I feel it my duty, before I accept your proposition, to tell you just exactly how I feel from a political point of view. The work you want me to take up for you is that of social service. I therefore want you to know that I am a Socialist pure and simple; I am not a theoretical Socialist, I am a prac-

tical one; I belong to the Socialist Labor Party; furthermore, I voted the Socialist ticket at the last election; and now knowing these facts, if you desire my services under these conditions, I will be happy to undertake this work." When the young man finished his sentence he was surely under the impression that the transaction with reference to this position will be closed, but not in his favor; when the president of the institution rose, shaking the young man's hand, said: "Young man, I, too, voted the Socialist ticket. I wish you Godspeed in your new position."

MR. S. B. KAUFMAN, Indianapolis: Permit me to quote two of the reflections that have been written about this Conference.

The first is: "Self-preservation is the first law of nature." This applies to the social worker. They give every day new remedies, but the same old troubles remain. Another is: "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

We have never come here but what we are bound to differ. A lawyer must study law and a doctor must study medicine, a preacher or rabbi must study the bible and theology. But, at the same time, a lawyer, to be a good lawyer, must be a medical and a rabbinical student. Just the same, the social worker must be a student of not the study of sociology alone, but he must be a student of social knowledge. For that reason, a social worker may not be a professional, but the social worker must be a student.

I will ask one question: Will the social worker come and tell the board of directors, if they happen to be millionaires, "Pay your men good salaries; I am a social worker, you employ hundreds of men; give your men good salaries?" Will the social worker do that?

The time will come when the social worker will be a simple reformer. That is his duty. Charity itself is an evil. They are all coming together, and they are discussing it in other cities, but we are accomplishing nothing. We still have suffering. In order to become a good social worker you must become a social reformer and be interested about it.

## BUSINESS MEETING.

SECRETARY WALDMAN: We will now have the report of the Committee on Nominations.

The following nominations were then presented by Dr. Bögen, Chairman of the Committee:

President, Dr. David Blaustein, New York, N. Y.

Secretary, Garfield A. Berlinsky, Louisville, Ky.

Treasurer, Max Mitchell, Boston, Mass.

Directors, Chester Teller, New Orleans, La.; Cecil B. Wiener, Buffalo, N. Y.; Ernestine Heller, Chicago, Ill.; J. W. Pincus, New York, N. Y.

It was duly moved and seconded that the report of the Committee be accepted.

Motion put and carried.

CHAIRMAN WIENER: The Reverend Doctor Mendel Silber will close the Conference with prayer.

## PRAYER.

REV. DR. MENDEL SILBER, St. Louis: Our Father in Heaven. In Thy name we have gathered to deliberate on a work that is pleasing in Thy sight. May the labors we have resolved to do receive Thy sanctifying spirit, so that Thy name be glorified by our endeavors and Thy children be benefited by our efforts. Grant, we beseech Thee, that the inspiration we have gotten from the contact with those who are engaged in pursuits of sweet charity be not effaced by the pressing cares of our busy lives, but remain ever present before our minds to increase constantly and continuously our capacity for benevolence, love and fellowship. Amen!

## REPORT OF TREASURER.

RECEIPTS SINCE MAY 1, 1908.

1908.			
May	1.	Balance as per report.....	\$ 1,847.22
May	2.	United Hebrew Charity Association, Lancaster, Pa.....	5.00
		United Hebrew Charities, Baltimore.....	9.00
		United Jewish Charities, Kansas City, Mo.	5.00
		Ladies' Benevolent Society, Des Moines, Ia.	5.00
June	22.	Home for Jewish Friendless and Working Girls, Chicago.....	20.00
July	6.	Hebrew Benevolent Association, Waco, Tex.	5.00
		April interest.....	2.85
		May interest.....	2.84
		June interest.....	2.54
July	8.	United Hebrew Charities, Montgomery, Ala. ....	5.00
Dec.	23.	Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Vicksburg .....	5.00
1909.			
Feb.	2.	Ladies' Relief Sewing Society, Milwaukee.	5.00
		Beth Israel Benevolent Society, Houston..	5.00
Feb.	6.	Hebrew Benevolent Society, Alexandria, Va. ....	5.00
		Hebrew Benevolent Society, Mobile, Ala..	5.00
		Federation of Jewish Charities, Atlanta...	5.00
		Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Niagara Falls.....	5.00
Feb.	8.	Temple Israel, Paducah, Ky.....	5.00
Feb.	10.	Council Jewish Women, New York.....	5.00
		United Hebrew Benevolent Association, Boston .....	17.00
		Young Ladies' Relief Society, Scranton, Pa.	5.00
		Free Synagogue, New York.....	5.00
		Congregation Emanu El, Dallas.....	5.00
		Jewish Ladies' Aid Society, Lincoln, Neb..	5.00
		Jewish Relief Society, St. Paul.....	5.00



		Ladies' Auxiliary, Y. M. H. A., Wilkes-Barre, Pa.....	5.00
		Hebrew Benevolent Society, Baltimore....	21.00
		Jewish Relief Society, Denver.....	5.00
		Jewish Ladies' Aid Society, Sioux City, Ia.	5.00
Feb.	13.	Jewish Orphan Asylum, Rochester.....	7.00
		Jewish Relief Society, Salt Lake City....	5.00
		Hebrew Orphans' Home, Atlanta, Ga....	13.00
		United Hebrew Charities, Philadelphia, Pa.	35.00
Feb.	15.	Federated Jewish Charities, Columbus, O.	5.00
		Montefiore Home, New York.....	50.00
		Emanu El Sisterhood, San Francisco....	5.00
		United Hebrew Congregation, Gainesville, Tenn. ....	5.00
		United Jewish Charities, Rochester, N. Y..	5.00
		Federated Jewish Charities, Baltimore....	50.00
Feb.	17.	United Hebrew Charities, Wheeling.....	5.00
		United Jewish Charities, Syracuse.....	5.00
		United Jewish Charities, Detroit.....	9.30
		Jewish Foster Home, Philadelphia.....	25.00
		United Hebrew Charities, New York....	50.00
		Detroit Ladies' Society for the Support of Hebrew Widows and Orphans.....	5.00
Feb.	20.	Hebrew Benevolent Society, Colorado Springs .....	5.00
		Federated Jewish Charities, Youngstown, O.	5.00
Feb.	23.	United Hebrew Charities, Washington, D. C.	5.00
		Hebrew Benevolent Society, Galveston....	5.00
		Ladies' Benevolent Society, St. Louis, Mo.	5.00
		Adath Israel Congregation, Louisville, Ky.	5.00
		Jewish Women's Benevolent Society, Portland, Ore.....	5.00
		Hebrew Ladies' Ben. Society, Minneapolis.	5.00
Feb.	24.	Hebrew Ladies' Relief Society, Dayton, O.	5.00
Feb.	26.	Daughters of Israel Relief Society, Oakland, Cal. ....	5.00
		Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Seattle	5.00

Feb.	28.	Hebrew Benevolent Society, Evansville, Ind.	5.00
		United Hebrew Charities, Montgomery, Ala.	5.00
		Hebrew Benevolent Society, Waco, Tex...	5.00
March	4.	Baron de Hirsch Fund, New York.....	50.00
		Hebrew Benevolent Society, Albany.....	5.00
		Associated Jewish Charities, Chicago.....	50.00
		Jewish Hospital Association, Philadelphia, Pa. ....	50.00
		Leopold Morse Home & Orphanage, Boston	11.00
March	5.	Jewish Charitable and Educational Union, St. Louis.....	45.00
March	8.	Hebrew Free Loan Society, New York....	5.00
		Ladies' Hebrew Benevolent Society, Savan- nah .....	5.00
March	10.	Chicago Woman's Aid Society.....	5.00
		Hebrew Benevolent Society, New Haven, Conn. ....	5.00
		Mt. Sinai Congregation, El Paso, Tex....	5.00
		Jewish Orphans' Home and Benevolent As- sociation, Meridian, Miss.....	5.00
March	11.	Jewish Women's Benevolent Association, Houston .....	5.00
		Federation Jewish Charities, Cleveland...	49.00
March	12.	Hebrew Relief Society, Nashville, Tenn...	5.00
March	13.	Orphans' Guardian Society, Philadelphia..	5.00
March	17.	Federated Jewish Charities, Des Moines..	5.00
		Hebrew Benevolent Society, Charleston..	5.00
		Young Women's Union, Philadelphia.....	15.00
		Ladies' Sanitary and Benevolent Society, Milwaukee .....	5.00
March	19.	Y. M. H. A., New York.....	5.00
March	23.	Temple Beth El, Pensacola, Fla.....	5.00
April	5.	Bureau of Personal Service, Chicago.....	5.00
		Jewish Orphan Asylum, Cleveland.....	50.00
April	7.	Mt. Sinai Hospital, Milwaukee.....	8.74
April	19.	Ladies' Aid Society, Portsmouth, O.....	5.00

April	28.	Temple Aid Society, Duluth, Minn.....	5.00
		United Hebrew Charities, Cincinnati.....	38.00
April	29.	Touro Infirmary and Benevolent Association of New Orleans.....	25.00
		Council of Jewish Women, Pittsburg.....	5.00
May	4.	Jewish Home Society, Albany.....	5.00
May	13.	United Hebrew Relief Society, Louisville..	5.00
		Hebrew Orphan Asylum, Newark.....	5.00
		United Jewish Charities, Kansas City....	5.00
May	26.	Independent Jewish Charities, Milwaukee, Wis. ....	5.00
		United Hebrew Charity Association, Sioux City, Ia.....	5.00
June	3.	Hebrew Relief Association, Peoria, Ill....	5.00
June	30.	Hebrew Benevolent Loan Society, Buffalo..	5.00
July	1.	Hebrew Board of Relief, San Francisco...	50.00
July	5.	Hebrew Ladies' Benevolent Society, Rich- mond .....	5.00
July	15.	Associated Jewish Charities, Vicksburg, Miss. ....	5.00
Sept.	15.	Association for Relief of Jewish Widows and Orphans, New Orleans.....	25.00
Oct.	21.	United Hebrew Charity Association of Lan- caster, Pa.....	5.00
Nov.	6.	United Hebrew Charities, Birmingham, Ala.	5.00
Nov.	10.	United Hebrew Relief Association, Memphis	10.00
		Hebrew Benevolent Society, Los Angeles, Cal. ....	5.00
Nov.	18.	Jewish Aid Society, Chicago.....	50.00
		Jewish Federation, Indianapolis.....	5.00
		Interest on deposit.....	12.64
		Interest on deposit.....	26.36
Nov.	22.	Congregation B'nai Israel, Kalamazoo....	5.00
		Montefiore Benevolent Society, San Antonio	10.00
Nov.	30.	Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society, New York	12.00
Nov.	30.	Braddock Lodge No. 516, I. O. B. B.....	5.00

Dec.	6.	Hebrew Ladies' Ben. Society, Toledo.....	5.00
		Hebrew Home for the Aged and Infirm Richmond, Va.....	5.00
		Congregation Beth Ahabah, Richmond, Va.	5.00
Dec.	14.	Hachnosas Orchim, Kansas City.....	5.00
Dec.	21.	Jewish Sheltering Home, Denver.....	5.00
Dec.	29.	Ladies' Hebrew Ben. Society, Vicksburg..	5.00
		United Hebrew Charities, Baltimore.....	28.00
1910.			
Jan.	12.	Federated Jewish Charities, Buffalo.....	9.00
Jan.	24.	Hebrew Relief Assn., Pine Bluff, Ark....	5.00
Feb.	1.	First Heb. Ben. Society, Portland, Ore....	5.00
Feb.	7.	Ladies' Aid Society, Portsmouth, Ohio....	5.00
		Jewish Home Society, Albany.....	5.00
Feb.	8.	Jewish Orphan Asylum, Rochester, N. Y..	7.00
		United Jewish Charities, Rochester, N. Y..	5.00
		United Jewish Charities, Detroit, Mich....	8.20
Feb.	10.	Hebrew Relief Society, Nashville, Tenn....	5.00
		United Hebrew Charities, Mobile.....	5.00
		Jewish Charities, Columbus.....	5.00
Feb.	14.	Hebrew Ben. Society, Waco, Tex.....	5.00
		Montefiore Home, New York.....	50.00
		Hebrew Benevolent Society, Evansville....	5.00
		Jewish Orphan Home, Meridian, Miss....	5.00
		Ladies' Auxiliary, Y. M. H. A., Wilkes- Barre, Pa.....	5.00
		Federation Jewish Charities, Louisville....	5.00
		Association Relief Jewish Widows and Orphans, New Orleans.....	25.00
Feb.	16.	Council Jewish Women, Washington.....	5.00
		Orphans' Home, Atlanta.....	13.00
		Adath Israel Congregation, Louisville....	5.00
		United Hebrew Charities, New York.....	50.00
Feb.	17.	Temple Israel, Paducah, Ky.....	5.00
		Ladies' Hebrew Ben. Society, Stockton....	10.00
		Congregation B'nai Israel, Kalamazoo....	5.00
		Jewish Ladies' Ben. Society, St. Joseph...	5.00

Feb.	21.	Jewish Federation, Indianapolis.....	5.00
		Jewish Foster Home, Philadelphia.....	25.00
		Ladies' Heb. Ben. Society, Niagara.....	5.00
		Jewish Women's Ben. Society, Portland..	5.00
		United Hebrew Congregation, Gainesville..	5.00
		Jewish Relief Society, Denver.....	5.00
		Heb. Ben. Society, Charleston.....	5.00
Feb.	22.	United Jewish Charities, Kansas City....	5.00
		Heb. Ben. Society, Los Angeles.....	5.00
Feb.	23.	Ladies' Relief Sewing Society, Milwaukee..	5.00
		Braddock Lodge, No. 516, I. O. B. B., Brad-	
		dock .....	5.00
March	1.	Heb. Ben. Society, New Haven, Conn....	5.00
		Associated Jewish Charities, Chicago.....	50.00
March	2.	Council Jewish Women, Pittsburg.....	5.00
		Heb. Ben. Society, Albany.....	5.00
		Orphans' Guardian Society, Philadelphia..	5.00
		Baron de Hirsch Fund, New York.....	50.00
		United Hebrew Relief, Philadelphia.....	35.00
		Free Loan Assn., New York.....	5.00
		Federation Jewish Charities, Cleveland...	53.00
March	8.	Jewish Ladies' Aid Society, Sioux City..	5.00
March	9.	United Hebrew Charities, Birmingham...	5.00
March	10.	Congregation Beth Ahabah, Richmond....	5.00
		Hebrew Home for Aged and Infirm.....	5.00
		Ladies' Heb. Ben. Society, Norfolk.....	5.00
		Federated Jewish Charities, Baltimore....	50.00
		Federated Jewish Charities, Des Moines..	5.00
		Free Synagogue, New York.....	5.00
		Hebrew Orphan Asylum and Ben. Society,	
		Newark .....	5.00
March	11.	Ladies' Fuel and Aid Society, New York..	5.00
		Jewish Women's Ben. Society, Houston..	5.00
		Chicago Women's Aid Society.....	5.00
		Jewish Relief Society, Salt Lake.....	5.00
		Daughters of Israel Rel. Society, Oakland.	5.00



March 12.	Beth Israel Ben. Society, Houston.....	5.00
	Heb. Ladies' Ben. Society, Toledo.....	5.00
March 16.	Young Men's H. Assn., New York.....	5.00
	Bureau of Personal Service, Chicago.....	5.00
	Hot Springs Disbursement Committee....	15.00
	Jewish Relief Society, St. Paul.....	5.00
	Heb. Ben. Society, Savannah.....	5.00
	Heb. Orphan Asylum, New York.....	50.00
	Mt. Sinai Congregation, El Paso.....	5.00
March 22.	Emanuel Sisterhood, San Francisco.....	5.00
March 25.	Jewish Ladies' Rel. Society, Scranton....	5.00
April 4.	Congregation Emanuel, Dallas.....	5.00
April 11.	Touro Infirmary and Heb. Ben. Society, New Orleans.....	25.00
	Hebrew Charity Assn., Wilmington.....	10.00
	United Hebrew Charity Assn., Sioux City..	5.00
	Boston Hebrew Women's Sewing Society..	10.00
	United Jewish Charities, Syracuse.....	5.00
April 15.	Hebrew Rel. Assn., Milwaukee.....	10.00
April 18.	Hebrew Ladies' Ben. Society, Seattle....	5.00
	Young Women's Union, Philadelphia....	15.00
April 23.	Jewish Charitable and Educational Union, St. Louis.....	45.00
April 27.	Temple Aid Society, Duluth.....	5.00
May 6.	United Jewish Charities, Cincinnati.....	28.00
May 7.	Hebrew Widows' and Orphans' Society....	5.00
May 13.	Federated Jewish Charities, Youngstown..	5.00
	Interest for November.....	3.25
	Interest for December.....	3.02
	Interest for January.....	2.46
	Interest for February.....	3.72
	Interest for March.....	2.62

---

\$4,170.76

## DISBURSEMENTS.

1908.			
May	1.	S. Lowenstein.....	\$ 35.00
		John H. Bennett.....	75.00
May	2.	S. Lowenstein.....	5.00
May	14.	A. Ginsberg & Bro.....	61.75
		Whitehead & Hoag.....	50.70
		H. L. Sabsovich.....	50.00
		S. Lowenstein.....	46.30
		Bernard Ginsburg.....	19.35
		Bernard Greensfelder.....	6.00
June	22.	Louis H. Levin, account rendered.....	25.09
July	6.	O. Raymond Brown.....	136.80
July	23.	Jos. Pedott.....	150.00
Oct.	1.	Jos. Pedott.....	100.00
Dec.	23.	Louis H. Levin, account rendered.....	42.65
		Meyer & Thalheimer.....	2.83
		Kohn & Pollock.....	45.00
1909.			
Feb.	2.	Jos. Pedott.....	150.00
		Louis H. Levin, account rendered.....	7.50
		Lee K. Frankel.....	5.00
March	22.	Louis H. Levin, account rendered.....	42.00
Oct.	28.	Louis H. Levin, account rendered.....	42.15
Nov.	18.	Exchange on checks.....	4.10
Nov.	24.	Louis H. Levin, account rendered.....	599.83
1910.			
March	25.	Louis H. Levin, account rendered.....	60.34
		Kohn & Pollock.....	29.75
April	22.	United States Express Co.....	1.10
		Exchange on checks.....	2.35
		Stenographic services.....	10.00
		Returned to Cleveland (over payment)...	3.00
Total .....			\$ 1,808.59

Total receipts.....	\$ 4,170.76
Total disbursements.....	1,808.59
	<hr/>
Balance .....	\$ 2,362.17
Balance on hand May 1, 1909.....	\$ 1,847.22
Receipts to May 15, 1910.....	2,318.54
	<hr/>
Total .....	\$ 4,170.76
Total disbursements.....	1,808.59
	<hr/>
Balance on hand.....	\$ 2,362.17

BERNARD GREENSFELDER,  
*Treasurer.*

## <sup>1</sup>Transportation Decisions

---

### <sup>2</sup> RULES FOR THE REGULATION OF TRANSPORTATION.

---

1. A Transient shall mean any person (including his family) who shall have become a charge upon the charities of the city where he may be, within nine months of the time of his arrival at that city, unless he shall have become dependent through unavoidable accident.

2. A telegraphic code shall be used for the prompt and economical exchange of information regarding transportation between the constituent associations, and each association agrees and binds itself to reply to all inquiries submitted to it as soon as the necessary investigations can be made.

3. No applicant for transportation shall be forwarded from one city to another, nor shall half-rate tickets, paid for by the applicant, be furnished without the advice and consent of the city of destination. But should the applicant be a transient within the meaning as above defined, he may be returned to the city where he last resided, not as a transient, or to any city where transportation shall have been furnished him; in either case, at the expense of the city to which he shall be returned, provided the statement as to residence be confirmed by investigation in said city. Whenever transportation is furnished, even if paid for by the applicant, notice shall be sent to the city of destination.

4. The initial city shall in all cases furnish transportation through to the city of destination. In the event of any violation of this rule, the receiving city, shall at its option, after investigation, transport the applicant to his destination or to the city from which he came, at the cost of the initial city.

<sup>1</sup> The Transportation Committee consists of Judge Julian W. Mack, chairman, Chicago; Mr. Max Senior, Cincinnati; Max Herzberg, Esq., Philadelphia. During Mr. Senior's absence from the country Judge Nathan Bijur of New York has acted in his place.

<sup>2</sup> The Rules are now in course of revision by the Transportation Committee.

5. Any woman wishing to seek or desiring to join her husband shall not be assisted with transportation under any circumstances without the consent of the city where it is claimed the husband resides.

6. Any violations, disputes or misunderstandings between constituent associations under these rules shall be referred to the Executive Committee, who shall investigate the same, and whose decision shall be final and binding.

---

NUMBER 1.

UNAUTHORIZED TRANSPORTATION.

*Removal Ordered by Physician—Funds Furnished by Non-Members—Protection of Health Resorts.*

---

On December 24, 1908, the town of *E* filed its claim with the National Conference of Jewish Charities against the city of *S* in the following statement, submitted under oath:

"I, Mrs. *G*, first being duly sworn, depose and say that I am the person who was, together with my husband and four children, sent to *E* by the Society of *S*. That the matron of the aforesaid institution Mrs. *S* and Mrs. *R* knew that I was pregnant; that I begged to be allowed to stay in *S* until after my confinement, and that my husband be sent on alone; that I was told to sell all my furniture before tickets for the journey would be purchased, and that I received from the sale of my furniture \$11 and for my sewing machine \$8; that *the matron of the Society purchased the tickets and handed them to me*, at the same time giving me the address of a resident of *E* and telling me how well the family that had been previously sent to that city was doing; that the \$20 collected at one of the synagogues was given to me some time before and used for food and clothes while in *S*; that the Society gave me \$15 for use on the road and that Mrs. *R* gave me an additional \$10 to induce me to accompany my husband, saying that it was my duty to go with him if I really loved him."

*E* has an estimated Jewish population of 350; *S* has an estimated Jewish population of 40,000. The latter is a large mer-



cantile and industrial center, the former has some reputation as a health resort for consumptives. Both are members of the National Conference.

The *G* family consisted of father, mother and four children at the time they moved from *S* to *E*. The man was tuberculous, and was advised by his physician to seek a change of climate. The woman was pregnant. There is evidence that the agents of the Society knew her condition. The family arrived at *E* without the permission of *E*, and was soon on the local charities. *Society at S admits furnishing transportation for G family*, but says that the funds were supplied by a non-Jewish immigration association. It also admits giving *G* some money, and maintains that at the time *G* left *S* he should have had nearly \$100 in his possession, besides transportation. *S* further maintains that the orders of *G*'s physician that he be sent away were imperative, and that *S* acted only from motives of humanity and in order to save human life in sending the *G* family to the town of *E*, and, moreover, they had been sent with sufficient funds to keep them until *G* could get work. *E* denies that *G* had the sum of money *S* asserts, and says that what *G* did have was spent in breaking up house at *S* and re-establishing it at *E*. A statement by a party who had personally helped the family at *S*, that he had enlisted the support of the Society at *S*, is filed by *E*, and is not denied by *S*.

*E* claimed expenses connected with the confinement of *G*'s wife, and \$5 a week toward supporting the family until *G* could become self-supporting. *S* offered to pay confinement expenses.

Submitted to the Transportation Committee—MACK, SENIOR and HERZBERG.

#### DECISION—(HERZBERG) :

*S*'s error consisted in the sending of this family without prior permission. and because of that fact should pay the bill presented.

The Committee fully recognizes the force of *S*'s argument, and the same questions confront all the larger cities.

Justice to the communities in the health resorts requires that no families be furnished with transportation unless investigation is first had and permission obtained. *If a family is sent without permission, the forwarding city must be held responsible*, if it runs

the chances of the family becoming self-supporting and it afterwards becomes dependent.

The Committee, in deciding the issue raised in favor of *B*, acquits *S* of any deliberate or willful violation of the rules, and is confident that its action was dictated by the humane intent to benefit a sickly and distressed family.

The decision was unanimous.

*Decision filed February 9, 1909.*

## NUMBER 2.

### INTERPRETATION OF RULE 3.

*Return of Transients to Place of Domicile—Responsibility for Voluntary Wanderers—Inadequate Telegrams.*

### INQUIRY FROM THE CITY OF L.

May we ask whether Rule 3 of the Conference Regulations governing transportation would admit of returning a family to another city, member of the Conference, who had not been furnished by the Charity Society with transportation, but had themselves paid it, and became a charge upon our Society within a few weeks after arrival here? We notice the rule provides that should the applicant be a transient within the meaning as defined by Rule 1, he may be returned to the city where he last resided, not as a transient, or to any city where transportation shall have been furnished him, etc. Are we to understand that the expense is to be borne by the city to which the applicant shall be returned, even if that city did not furnish the transportation on the going trip?

Submitted to the Transportation Committee—MACK, SENIOR and HERZBERG.

### DECISION—(HERZBERG) :

The question submitted to the Transportation Committee for decision is, whether an applicant for charity, being a transient, may be returned to the city where he belongs, at the expense of that city, even if such city did not furnish the original transportation, but which was paid for by the applicant himself?

I am of the opinion that Rule 3 does not cover such a case, nor was it the intention of the framers of the rules to impose such a burden upon the home city. The manifest intention of the rules was to discourage the granting of tickets or the assistance of an intended traveler without the permission of the city of destination, and to penalize the home city only for an infraction of such rule. There would be little justice in attempting to make each city responsible for the voluntary acts of all the people who live in it, and to hold a contrary opinion, might only encourage persons to wander to other cities with the knowledge that they would surely be returned without cost to themselves, and at the expense of the city from which they came.

When an applicant, being a transient, applies for assistance in any city, such city may return him at its own expense to the city where he really belongs, and return him at the expense of his home city only if the transportation is furnished to him, either gratuitously or upon his payment therefor, without the consent of the city of destination.

I am willing to concede that the language of the rule may be somewhat obscure, and that it might have been worded more clearly, but I think that the words, "where transportation shall have been furnished him," refers both "to the city where he last resided not as transient" and "or to any city."

The main purpose of these rules was to discourage the practice of furnishing transportation without properly investigating or obtaining the consent of the city of destination, and to prevent the practice, unhappily common theretofore, of getting rid of a burden by foisting it upon another community. That practice has been summarily stopped by the adoption and enforcement of these rules, and it would be unfortunate if they were enlarged by attempting to hold a city responsible for all its inhabitants who may choose to wander or change their habitation without the advice or assistance of the city which they claim as their home. Such a rule could never be enforced, for the cases that would spring up under it would be legion, and the hardships thus imposed would cause a total disregard of the rules and rulings of the Transportation Committee.

## L. vs. P.

The facts in this case come directly under the ruling just laid down interpreting Rule 3. It is conceded that applicant had not been assisted to leave by *P*. The following telegrams were exchanged between *L* and *P*, while discussing the case:

## L TO P.

"*M. G.*, discharged Denver patient, claims lived care Mrs. B. D., 318 A. Ave. Verify."

## P TO L.

"*G* is a regular schnorrer has no relation very well known here."  
*L* interpreted the latter telegram to mean that *G* was a resident of *P*, and sent him to that city.

## DECISION—(MACK):

1. In accordance with the recent decision as to Rule 3, *L* has no claim, inasmuch as there is no proof that *P* assisted the applicant in leaving.
2. In any event, *P*'s reply did not justify the inference that *G* was a resident of *P*.
3. *P*, however, should have given a more definite answer in the interest of economy in telegraphing. The reply justified a counter inquiry.

---

NUMBER 3.

## L. vs. N.

In this case *N* expressed no objection to the return of the applicant to that city, where he had a sister to receive him, but disclaimed responsibility for expense of the return because applicant had left *N* without assistance from any of the charities. *Held*, that *N* is not responsible for the return charges under the interpretation of Rule 3, above given.

Decisions were unanimous.

*Filed August 24, 1909.*

## NUMBER 4.

## PASSING PATIENTS ALONG TO DENVER.

*Duty of City Receiving Patients Bound for Denver—"The Spirit of True Jewish Benevolence"—City Receiving in Error not Justified in Forwarding in Error.*

---

## C. vs. T.

*C* asks for a ruling in the following case: Mrs. *N. Z.*, with three children, called at the office of *C* and requested aid in traveling to Denver. She came originally from *Ph.*, where there is no organized Jewish charity. From *Ph.* she went or was sent to *P*, thence to *Ch.*, thence to *Y*, which sent her to *T*, and *T*, which is a member of the National Conference of Jewish Charities, forwarded her to *C*, which thereupon filed its complaint against *T*. *T* does not deny sending the family to *C*, and in defence of its action says:

"When a poor Jewish woman comes here with three children, two of whom are afflicted with tuberculosis, on her way to Denver for treatment and possible cure, friendless and moneyless, what would you consider the proper course for us to pursue? Surely, you would not have them sent back East, whence they came, and thus retard their journey and thereby diminish the chances for treatment at Denver. . . . We certainly have been obliged to handle this case in a spirit of true Jewish Benevolence."

There is nothing in the record to show that the cases were suitable for treatment at Denver, and at the last meeting of the National Conference of Jewish Charities the following resolution was adopted:

*Resolved*, That the efficiency of the National Jewish Hospital for Consumptives should not be impaired by sending of such advanced cases as are not suitable for treatment in that institution."

Submitted to the Transportation Committee—MACK. SENIOR and HERZBERG.



## DECISION—(SENIOR) :

The language of the transportation rule is so plain that it cannot be mistaken.

*T*, having forwarded the *Z* family to *C*, without *C*'s consent, and that family having become a charge upon *C* charities, *T* is responsible for all charges incurred by *C*, regardless of the fact that, according to the statement of *T*, the family did not originate in that city.

Of course, *T*, in turn, will have a valid claim upon *Ch.* or *Y* or *P* for all expenses incurred in *C*, as well as any incurred in *T*, if the *T* charities can prove that the *Z* family was forwarded from either of the cities mentioned by the charity organization of that city. I would especially urge upon *T* to present such a claim, in case *T* can prove its contention.

I wish to emphasize that it is not "a spirit of true Jewish benevolence" to unload a sick and helpless family upon any other city, and especially upon a city already so overburdened as Denver.

Decision unanimous.

*Filed February 7, 1910.*

---

 NUMBER 5.

 STATUS OF PERSONS SENT OUT BY INDUSTRIAL  
 REMOVAL OFFICE.

*Construction of Contract with Industrial Removal Office—  
 Tuberculosis as Unavoidable Accident—The Responsibility  
 of Metropolitan Cities—Moot Cases Not Approved.*

---

 L. vs. C.

The complaint in this case was filed by *L* against *C* on April 4, 1910. The facts are sufficiently stated in the opinion of the Committee.

Decision by Judge Mack, in which Mr. Herzberg and Judge Bijur concurred.

## DECISION—(MACK):

*J. B.*, who had lived with his wife and three children in New York for 9 years, and had always supported them, was induced by the Industrial Removal Office to go to *L*, which, under contract with the *I. R. O.*, accepted him and found work for him, giving him only temporary assistance until work was found. After 5 months' residence, and against the advice of the Superintendent of the Federated Jewish Charities of *L*, he took his family to *N* at the request of his wife's sister, who resided there. He at once found work in *C*, which is just across the river from *N*. The *N* Jews are nearly all of the working class, have no organization, and in serious cases are assisted by the United Jewish Charities of *C*, of which it is practically a suburb. A fourth child was born there.

After 5 months *B* developed tuberculosis, consulted the physicians of the Denver Hospital in *C*, who refused pay, and recommended him to the United Jewish Charities for treatment at Denver.

*C*, in order to secure an interpretation of the transportation rules of the National Conference of Jewish Charities, sent the family back to *L*.

*L* claims reimbursement for all outlays resulting from the return of the family by *C*, on the following grounds:

1. *B* was not a resident of *L*, as he had resided there less than 9 months. He was therefore a transient within Rule 1.

2. His illness was of 5 weeks' duration. It was an unavoidable accident within Rule 1, and the family should not, even if deemed residents of *L*, have been returned.

3. *C* was not responsible for him. *N* was his residence. If *C* helped out of humanitarian considerations, it could not for that reason compel another constituent society to assist it in the care of families residing either permanently or temporarily in a non-constituent city—*N*.

*C* counterclaims its expenses on the ground that as *L* by its contract with the *I. R. O.* assumed the care of the family, *B* must be treated in all respects like a resident of *L*, irrespective of his period of residence.

In our judgment, *C* should not have returned the family merely to secure a ruling. The Committee is, or should be, deemed empowered to settle actual controversies between the parties, without compelling the unnecessary shifting about of families. As to the questions raised, we hold:

1. *B* was a transient in *L*, whatever *L*'s obligations may be toward the *I. R. O.* Under our rules, he must be deemed a transient—9 months' residence means actual residence.

2. An illness that develops from causes not existing at the time of residence in the former home is to be deemed an unavoidable accident within Rule 1.

The object of the rule was to enable the return of dependents, who had been shifted about, not of actual workers, who had been self-sustaining in their former homes, had left voluntarily and at their own expense and had then in their new home met with sudden disaster, due to causes not theretofore existing.

Whether or not the causes of the tuberculosis existed in *L* is not clear. In view, however, of our first finding, this becomes immaterial.

3. *N* is the residence of people working in the city of *C*, and is to be deemed a part of *C*, within the meaning of our rules. Its Jews, especially those working in *C*, are essentially a part of the Jewish community of *C*. This applies to all suburban localities, whether technically a part of the city or separate municipalities in the same county or State, or even in another State, if the locality is for practical purposes, so far as the Jews are concerned, a part of the metropolitan community.

4. *C*'s counterclaim is for the foregoing reasons denied, and *L*'s claim upheld.

*Filed August 8, 1910.*

## NUMBER 6.

## PART TRANSPORTATION.

*Sending Applicant to Nearest Large City—Right of City Completing Transportation to Reimbursement.*

---

L. vs. P.

Submitted to Transportation Committee—MACK, HERZBERG and BIJUR.

DECISION—(HERZBERG):

*P* is a small city in the neighborhood of *L*, and has a relief society in connection with its synagogue.

*A*, who was a transient in *P*, his home being New York, applied for assistance. The president of the society furnished him with transportation to *L*, with a letter to the society there, recommending him for further assistance. *L*, after investigation, sent *A* to his home in New York, and claims the expense from *P*.

*P* in its letters stated that its finances would not permit it to furnish transportation further than *L*, and, unless such transportation were furnished, *A* would have become a burden on *P*.

This case is so clear a violation of the rules that the mere statement of the facts is sufficient to justify our ruling that *P* should reimburse *L* for its expenses incurred in the case.

It was to prevent such conduct that these rules were promulgated, and it is to the interest of every community to see that they are strictly enforced. All concur.

*Filed September 20, 1910.*

---

NUMBER 7.

## TAKING THE HUSBAND'S WORD.

*Uniting Family Ill-advisedly—Transportation Given on Information of Husband—Such Information Does Not Suspend Rules.*

---

D. vs. G.

The papers in this case show that the *R* family had been on the charities of *G* for some time, when Mrs. *R* appeared with a letter

from her husband, who had gone to the city of *D*, in which letter he stated that he was able and willing to support his family. The city of *G* accepted the statement, but made no inquiry of the city of *D* whether the family might be sent to *D* with its consent. Transportation was furnished them by *G* to *D*. When the family were reunited at *D* the man was unable to support them, the wife was in a delicate condition, and they came upon the charities of *D*. *D* claims reimbursement for all funds expended on the family. Further facts are stated in the decision.

Submitted to Transportation Committee—MACK, HERZBERG and BIJUR.

#### DECISION—(BIJUR) :

The essential and admitted facts of this case are:

Mrs. *R* applied for aid to the Relief Society of *D*. She was in ill health, about to be confined, and accompanied by three minor children. Her husband had preceded her to *D* by about six months. She had been furnished with a ticket to *D* from *G* by the Relief Society of the latter city, where she had previously resided. She had been dependent upon the society in *G* for some months; and upon her statement and that of her husband that he was able and willing to send for her and support her and her children in *D* she was furnished with the ticket hereinbefore mentioned.

The society in *G* explains that it believed that the husband could make use of the money—which he would otherwise have expended for railroad fares—for household furniture, etc. The head of the society in *G* also writes, "I did not *have anything* to do with their going to *D*, *except that* I, of my own accord, furnished them with transportation."

While it is evident from the record that the officers of the society in *G* were actuated by kindly motives, nevertheless the entire proceeding is so palpably a violation of the transportation rules of the Conference that it is surprising that the society at *G* should not voluntarily have anticipated the decision of this committee that it is liable to *D* for all its proper disbursements in the premises.

All concur.

*Filed October 5, 1910.*



## INDEX.

- ABRAHAMS, ISRAEL, on Medieval Desertion, 55.
- ADDAMS, JANE, 39.
- ADDRESS OF WELCOME, Hon. Elias Michael, 29-31.
- AGRICULTURE, Jews should be encouraged to engage in, 130, 131; men now profitably engaged in, 130; the hope of distribution, 150; training farms suggested, 151; failure of farm experiment, 152, 165, 166; farming, 249, 271.
- AGUNAH, 56.
- BARON DE HIRSCH TRADE SCHOOL, 249.
- BASHEIN, JACOB, 234.
- BERLINSKY, G. A., 106, 297.
- BIENENSTOCK, MONTEFIORE, 265.
- BILLIKOPF, JACOB, 107, 160.
- BLAUSTEIN, DR. DAVID, 297.
- BOARDS, often apply business standards to charity, 260; are responsible to community, 261; should keep pace with the paid workers, 262; should educate themselves on social questions, 268; are social workers, 269.
- BOGEN, BORIS D., 103, 254, 273, 281, 297.
- BRESSLER, DAVID M., 111, 166, 209.
- BUREAU OF DISTRIBUTION, failure of, 153.
- BUSINESS MEETING, 199.
- CHARITIES, general, debt of, to Jewish, 39.
- CHARITY, common sense in, 33; science in, 34, 278; will become a municipal function, 256, 267.
- CHARITY, Jewish, wide scope of, 11; fundamental purpose of, 30; peculiar problems of, 31; recent change in spirit of, 32; organization of, 36, 279-281; warrant for, 36-38; not preventive, 286.
- CHARITY WORKER, relation of Jewish to general, 38.
- CHILDREN, Jewish dependent, board- ing of, 40, 207; CHILDREN in private homes, 205; bureaus for, in New York City, 205; work supervised by the State Board of Charities, 207; statistics, 208; attack upon, 208; advantages of, 210; effect upon the children, 210, 211; as practiced formerly, 219, 220; problem peculiarly great in New York, 220; affected by conditions, 229; homes good in Chicago, 234; in experimental stage, 235; has good effect on health, 235; institutions for, 205; models for mothers, 230; homes should be investigated, 206, 223; attend public schools, 207; religious schools, 207; health supervised, 207; clothing, 207; receive individual attention, 209; surroundings, 209; difficulty of finding good homes, 220; homes, should be inspected, 224; poor conditions in, 224, 225; selfish motives in, 225; advantages of institutions for, 226; cottage type of, 226; atypical, 227, 229; homes for, 231, 236; in non-Jewish homes, 232; as companions, 236, 237; of widowed mothers, in institutions, 238; cause of dependence of, 240; health tests of, 241; special dietaries for, 241; physically defective, 242; industrial training of, 242, 243, 246, 249, 252; education of, 239, 243, 244, 251, 252, 253; religious training of, 239, 240; vocational training of, 243, 246; See Mothers, Orphan Asylums and Pensioning Widowed Mothers.
- CLARA DE HIRSCH HOME FOR WORK- ing Girls, 249.
- COFFEE, REV. RUDOLPH I., 271.
- COMMITTEE ON PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE, Report of, 167.

- COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION, Report of, 41.
- CONSTITUTION, 7-9.
- COURT OF DOMESTIC RELATIONS, 78, 94.
- DECISIONS OF TRANSPORTATION Committee, 48, 307.
- DELEGATES, Register of, 19-24.
- DESERTION, Central Bureau of, Recommended, 49, 77, 104; not a distinctly Jewish problem, 54, 110; greater among non-Jews, 55; old evil, 55; legislation against, in Middle Ages, 55; Treated in *Shulchan Aruch*, 56; few cases in Kansas City, 56; and in Cincinnati, 57; children deserted, 56; percentages of, in various cities, 56, 58; money spent on deserted families, 56, 110; difficult to obtain uniform statistics, 58; causes of, 58; et seq., 87; immorality, 62; lack of work, 62-65; insufficient earnings, 65; birth of child, 65; incompatibility of temper, 65, 66; disparity in age, 66; Jewish causes, different, 104, 105; investigation of, in 1902, 59, 60, 62; Zilpha D. Smith on, 59, 61; Lilian Brandt on, 61; age of deserters, 67; frequency of, 67, 68; length of, 69, 70, 72, 73; return of deserters, 70, 71; remedies for, 71; Cincinnati plan for treating, 71-73, 84, 85, 101, 106; criticised, 102, 103; permanency of, 72; case of, involving New York and London, 74; as an extraditable offense, 76, 78; results of prosecution for, in New York, 76; has relatively decreased in New York, 76; misdemeanor or felony, 77, 78;
- DESERTION, should have special State supervision, 78; court of domestic relations suggested, 78, 94; William C. Baldwin on, 79, 80; family of deserter paid for prison work, 79; as handled in Washington Juvenile Court, 80, 100; forms for study of, 81-83; discussion of, 84 et seq.; New York experiences unique, 84; much does not reach charitable organization, 84; definition of, desirable, 86; reason for considering at charity conference, 86; not limited to the poor, 86; results, not causes, primary consideration, 87; among the rich, 87; ways of handling by courts, 87; courts not eager to inflict punishment, 88, 96; causes aggravated in heterogeneous community, 88; Missouri doctrine, 88, 89; Educational Alliance combatting, 89, 90; method of New York Legal Aid Bureau, 90, 91; result in certain cases, 91, 92; complication of the question, 92; effect of *get*, 92; legal dilemma for Russian Jew, 93; *get* without divorce misdemeanor in New York, 93; photographs of deserters generally obtainable, 100; methods of apprehending deserters, 97; police unreliable, 97; Yiddish papers can be of service, 98, 99; deserters generally go to large cities, 99; objection to statistics of, 94; deserter, bad rather than unfortunate, 96; difficulty of handling the evil of, 96; uniform laws, desirable, 96, 103, 199; wives should be helped, 102; mistaken help dangerous, 103; Illinois progressive laws on, 105; education of wife as remedy, 105; none in Roumania, 105;

- DESERTION**, Americanized husband and foreign wife, 105;  
friendly visitors and social settlements, as remedial agents, 106;  
Kansas City plan of meeting, 107;  
approved, 110;  
parole system for deserters, 107;  
specific case of paroled deserter, 108;  
not on increase, 110;  
prevention, the keynote, 106;  
among clients of Industrial Removal Office, 147.
- DRUCKER, SAUL**, 229.
- ELECTION**, of officers and directors, 203
- ELECTION OF OFFICERS OF SECTION OF Social Workers**, 297.
- EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY LAW IN OHIO**, 192;  
abolition of strict rule of negligence, 192-194.
- "**FAMILY DESERTION**," 54-83.
- FARMERS (JEWISH) IN THE UNITED States**, 249;  
in New Jersey, 250.
- FREE LOAN SOCIETIES**, See Gemillath Chasodim.
- FRIENDLY INNS**: See Hachnosas Orchim.
- FRISCH, RABBI EPHRAIM**, 144.
- FROHLICHSTEIN, S. H.**, 158.
- FURTH, JACOB**, 162.
- GALVESTON MOVEMENT**, 122;  
method of work, 125;  
committees created in west and southwest, 125;  
port unknown to immigrants, 125;  
not an experiment, 126;  
number distributed, 126;  
sympathetically received by German and Russian element, 126;  
infuses pioneer spirit into immigrants, 126;  
transportation, shortcomings of, 127;  
can become effective means of distribution, 127;  
ignorance of immigrants a drawback, 128.
- GEMILLATH CHASODIM**, 45-46.
- GET**, complicates question of desertion, 92;  
without divorce, misdemeanor in New York, 93;
- GOLDSTEIN, RABBI SIDNEY E.**, 287,
- GREENSFELDER, BERNARD**, 186.
- HACHNOSAS ORCHIM**, 45-46.
- HARRISON, RABBI LEON**, 53.
- HEBREW ORPHAN ASYLUM OF NEW York City**, work of the, in connection with boarding out children and pensioning widowed mothers, 204-219.
- HEBREW SHELTERING GUARDIAN Society of New York City**, work of, in boarding out children and pensioning widowed mothers, 204-219.
- HEBREW TECHNICAL SCHOOL FOR Boys**, 249.
- HEBREW TECHNICAL SCHOOL FOR Girls**, 249.
- HELLER, ERNESTINE**, 297.
- HERZBERG, MAX**, 197.
- HOLLANDER, PROFESSOR J. H.**, 32.
- IMMIGRANTS**, distracted by life of New York, 113;  
just like other men, 115;  
should be attracted to the farm, 130;  
become rapidly Americanized, 147;  
their percentage of wrong-doing less than of native-born, 156.
- IMMIGRATION DEMANDS CONTINUATION of Jewish Charities**, 42;  
not a Jewish problem only, 42;  
Jewish immigrants needed, 43;  
should be considered in regard to best interests of this country, 43;  
very valuable to this country, 43;  
dangers of, 44;  
American Jews must meet problems of, 44;  
threatened by unfounded cry, 154;  
should not be restricted, 156;  
See Galveston movement, Industrial Removal Office and Removal work.
- INDUSTRIAL REMOVAL OFFICE**, 111;  
meets a definite need, 111;  
is clearing-house for Jewish immigration, 112;  
to distribute descriptive leaflets, 128;  
résumé of work of, 132;  
occupations of those distributed, 133-135;  
in Philadelphia and Boston, 136.

- JEWISH IMMIGRANTS' INFORMATION Bureau**, report of, 137-139;  
occupations of immigrants handled by, 140;  
See Galveston Movement.
- JEWISH HOME FINDING SOCIETY OF Chicago**, 231
- KALISKY, MIRIAM**, 105.
- KAUFMAN, S. B.**, 104, 296.
- LANDSBERG, DR. MAX**, 237
- LEGAL AID**, 168;  
has not received sufficient attention, 168;  
many requests for, 169;  
legal technicalities create difficulties, 170, 171;  
ethics of members of the bar, 170, 172;  
simplification of procedure desired, 170;  
administration of justice neither satisfactory nor logical, 170;  
justice often case of money, 172;  
preventive measures in Chicago, 173;  
hundreds of preventable arrests, 173;  
courts breed useless strife, 174;  
agents at police stations intercept legislation, 174;  
persons dissuaded from litigating, 174;  
cases arbitrated out of court, 174;  
large numbers involved in cases, 174;  
judges now co-operate with workers, 175, 195;  
classification of cases handled in Chicago, 175-176;  
foreigners pursued by police, 177;  
social worker protects them, 177;  
Illinois "Contributing Act" very helpful, 178;  
money collected for neglected families, 178;  
social workers in criminal courts, 179;  
social workers in insane courts, 180;  
personal injury cases successfully handled, 182;  
adherence to letter of law dooms many, 184;  
tremendous step forward, 184;  
courts appreciate services of social workers, 185;  
discussion of, 186;  
paid worker necessary, 187;
- LEGAL AID**, expenditures in large cities not warranted in small, 187;  
"Contributing Act" approved, 187;  
in St. Louis, 188;
- LEGAL AID DISPENSARIES UNDER STATE control**, 189;  
a beginning in Colorado, 189;  
something similar in Nuremberg, 189;  
subdivision of philanthropy, 190;  
exceptions to some of Miss Low's statements, 191;  
in Cincinnati, 194;  
police should pass upon issuance of warrants, 195;  
infractions of the law not to be condoned, 196;  
necessary part of modern charity, 196;  
to be rendered only to those actually in need, 197;  
not to interfere in criminal actions, 197;  
nor negligence cases, 197;  
discouragement of litigation, 197;  
necessity for uniform laws, 199.
- LEUCHT, RABBI I. L.**, 157.
- LEVI, LEO N.**, suggested removal work, 163;
- LEVIN, LOUIS H.**, 45, 278.
- LOW, MINNIE F.**, 168, 198, 232;
- LOWENSTEIN, SOLOMON**, 204.
- MACK, JUDGE JULIAN W.**, 41.
- MANHATTAN TRADE SCHOOL FOR GIRLS**, 249.
- MARKS, MARTIN A.**, 167.
- MAUSER, HENRY**, 219.
- MAY, MAX B.**, 191.
- MEETINGS**, informal, between Biennial Conferences, 52;  
annual, desirable, 52.
- MEMBERSHIP LIST**, 10-18.
- MEMBERS**, individual, desirable, 52, 53;
- MICHAEL, HON. ELIAS**, 29.
- MITCHELL, MAX**, 297.
- MOTHERS**, keep children with, 40;  
competence of, 238;  
See Children and Pensioning Widowed mothers.
- NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF JEWISH Charities**, Prime Purpose of, 42;  
should have comprehensive membership, 42;



- NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF JEWISH Charities, local charities should affiliate with, 46;  
 membership increased, 47;  
 Yiddish societies should join, 47, 51;  
 new members of, 47, 48;  
 use of funds of, 48;  
 Traveling Scholarship of, discontinued, 48;  
 individual membership in, desirable, 49;
- NEWMAN, A. S., 95.
- OFFICERS, list of, 1908-1910, 5; 1910-1912, 6.
- OHIO HUMANE SOCIETY, 56, 71, 85, 102, 103, 106, 195.
- ORPHAN ASYLUM, not an experiment, 237;  
 should be temporary, 238;  
 after-care by, 253;  
 See Children.
- PAGE COMMISSION, 189, 190.
- PENSIONING WIDOWED MOTHERS, A Study of the Problem of, 204-219;  
 questions for the study of cases, 211, 212;  
 tabulation of information concerning, 213-215;  
 housing conditions, 215, 216;  
 employment of children, 216;  
 health of families, 216, 217;  
 recreations of children, 217;  
 delinquency rare, 217;  
 relief statistics, 217;  
 support must be adequate, 218;  
 requires supervision, 218;  
 needs friendly visitor, 218;  
 unsatisfactory homes, 227;  
 ample relief to, in Chicago, 233;  
 may not go out to work, 233;  
 should not be separated from children even temporarily, 234.
- PINCUS, J. W., 297.
- PRAYER, by Rabbi Samuel Sale, 28;  
 by Rabbi Leon Harrison, 53;  
 by Rabbi Mendel Silber, 297.
- PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS, by Professor J. H. Hollander, 32-39.
- PROCEEDINGS, 19.
- PROGRAM, of the Conference, 25;  
 of the Section of Jewish Social Workers, 26.
- REEDER, RUDOLPH R., on institutions for children, 225, 226.
- "RELATION BETWEEN THE SOCIAL Worker and His Organization, The," 254-265.
- REMOVAL WORK, Including Galveston, 111;  
 not designed simply to meet emergencies, 112;  
 is constructive, 112;  
 both philanthropic and economic, 113;  
 has dual aspect, 113;  
 number removed, 114;  
 method of, 114, 115;  
 rules governing, 115-117;  
 kind of position for applicants, 116;  
 task of receiving community, 116;  
 social necessities of removed applicants, 117;  
 applicants often highly skilled, 118;  
 many places able to receive applicants, 118;  
 machinery of distribution should be perfected, 119, 149;  
 not sufficiently widespread, 119;  
 to create nuclei of immigrants, 119;  
 some beneficiaries unreasonable, 120;  
 smaller towns should help, 120;  
 many trades represented among beneficiaries, 121;  
 seeks to make distribution automatic, 122;  
 illustrated lectures well received, 128;  
 transportation costly, 129;  
 discussion of, 141, et seq.;  
 local peculiarities of receiving communities, 141;  
 local prejudice against Jews, 142;  
 immigrant house in Minneapolis, 142;  
 Minneapolis method, 143;  
 B'nai B'rith and, 143, 158, 159;  
 advantages of, to beneficiaries, 145;  
 work well done, 145;  
 more skilled workmen now applying, 146;  
 work at Pine Bluff, Ark., 146, et seq.;  
 non-Jewish Associations interested in, 148;  
 shops to test skill of applicants, 150;  
 "sympathetic distribution," 153;  
 drawbacks in New Orleans, 157;  
 cannot take large number, 157;  
 in St. Louis, 159;  
 in Kansas City, 160, 161;



- REMOVAL WORK in Memphis, 165;  
See Galveston Movement Industrial Removal Office.
- RESOLUTIONS, 200-202.
- RULES FOR THE REGULATION OF  
Transportation, 307.
- SABSOVICH, H. L., 248.
- SALE, RABBI SAMUEL, 28.
- SAMFIELD, RABBI M., 165.
- SCHIFF, JACOB H., 123, 144, 161.
- SCHOLARSHIP, Traveling, discontinued,  
48.
- SCHULMAN, RABBI SAMUEL, 277.
- SEAMAN, PHILIP L., 291.
- SECRETARY, Report of, 45.
- SECTION OF SOCIAL WORKERS, 52, 204-  
297.
- SENIOR, MAX, 84.
- SHULCHAN ARUCH, treats desertion, 56.
- SILBER, RABBI MENDEL, 297.
- SOCIAL SERVICE, not a profession, 288;  
is a profession, 292;  
does not center about the relief office,  
293;  
and socialism, 295-296.
- "SOCIAL WORK AS A PROFESSION,"  
278-289.
- SOCIAL WORKER, should have respect  
for his community, 254, 262-  
263;  
qualifications for, 255-256, 270;  
necessity of, 256;  
should have confidence of board of  
managers, 257;  
interviews on relations with organiza-  
tions, 258-259;  
should be a leader, 262;  
should not emphasize the faults of  
the poor, 263;  
relation to the beneficiaries, 264, 265;  
should know the community, 266;  
should work with the municipal au-  
thorities, 267;  
should be of high intelligence, 270;  
relation to boards and individual  
member, 271;  
ignorance of, 271-272;  
social standing, 273, 284, 290, 291;  
differentiated by study, 281;  
number among Jews, 281, 282;  
likely to increase, 286;  
function, 282, 283;  
has future of unusual opportunities,  
284;  
should harmonize the older and the  
later charities, 285;
- SOCIAL WORKER, should organize  
Jewish charitable forces to aid  
movements for general benefit,  
285;  
narrowed by his special field, 289;  
often untrained, 290;  
should be reformer, 296;  
description of, 296.
- SOLOMON, MRS. HENRY, 103, 198, 231,  
237.
- "SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR JEWISH  
Dependent Children with Partic-  
ular Reference to Industrial  
and Technical Training," 239-  
248.
- STIX, MRS. C. A., 101.
- "STUDY OF THE PROBLEM OF BOARDING  
Out Jewish Children and of  
Pensioning Widowed Mothers,"  
204-219.
- SULZBERGER, CYRUS L., 104, 152, 272.
- TELLER, CHESTER J., 228, 270, 297.
- TRAINING, Jewish, 251.
- TRANSPORTATION, Basis of the National  
Organization, 41.
- TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE, De-  
cisions of, 48, 307.
- TUSKA, BENJAMIN, 86.
- UNITED HEBREW CHARITIES, of New  
York City, work of, in co-op-  
eration with orphan asylums, in  
subsidizing widowed mothers,  
204-219.
- "VINELAND'S SWEETS," 250.
- WALDMAN, MORRIS D., 54, 209, 227,  
296.
- WEIL, JONAS, 141.
- WEST, JAMES E., on finding homes for  
children, 223.
- WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON THE  
Care of Dependent Children,  
222.
- WEINER, CECIL B., 253, 297.
- WOLFENSTEIN, DR. S., 204, 237.
- WOOLF, HENRY, 250.
- WORK OF THE Y. M. H. A. OF NEW  
York, 274-278.
- WYLE, ARMAND, 222.
- Y. M. H. A., 274-278.
- YOUNKER, FALK, 274.







University of California  
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY  
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388  
Return this material to the library  
from which it was borrowed.

---

---



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



**A** 001 160 670 4

